Third Series, Vol. LVIII, No.20

Monday, August 22, 1966
Sravana 31, 1888 (Saka)

LOK SABHA DEBATES

(THIRD SERIES)

Vol. LVIII, 1966/1888 (Saka)

[*August 8 to 22, 1966/Sravana 17 to 31, 1888 (Saka)*]

Fifteenth Session, 1966/1888 (Saka)

(*Vol. LVIII contains Nos. 11 to 20*)

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

CONTENTS

No. 20—Monday, August 22, 1966/Sravan 31, 1888 (Saka)

	COLUMNS
Oral Answers to Questions :	
*Starred Questions Nos. 569 to 572 and 574 to 576	5909—41
Short Notice Question No.14	5942—43
Written Answers to Questions :	
Starred Questions Nos. 577 to 588 and 590 to 598	5943—59
Unstarred Questions Nos. 2844 to 2856 and 2858 to 2960	5959—6043
Correction of answer to Unstarred Question No. 5666 dated 16-5-66	6043
Calling Attention to Matter of Urgent Public Importance—	
Reported Complaint of Chief Minister of J & K State against Central Government	6044,7136—46
Re. Calling Attention Notices (*Query*)	6045—48
Re. Question of Privilege against Minister of Education	6048—66
Papers Laid on the Table	6066—67
Message from Rajya Sabha	6067
Railway Property (Unlawful Possession) Bill—	
As passed by Rajya Sabha	6068
Committee of Privileges—	6068
Nineth Report	
Delhi Sales-Tax Bill—	
Motion to introduce —*opposed*	6068—75
Motion Re. Fifty-Fifth Report of Public Accounts Committee :	6076—6236
Shri Surendranath Dwivedy	6090—92,6097—6111,6219—22
Shri Daji	6118—34
Shri K. C. Pant	6139—49
Shri Ranga	6149—57
Shri Heda	6157—62
Shri Madhu Limaye	6162—78
Shri Khadilkar	6178—86
Shri Nambiar	6186—93
Shri G. N. Dixit	6193—99
Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri	6199—6204
Shri Swaran Singh	6204—05
Shri Morarka	6205—09
Shri Hukam Chand Kachhavaiya	6209—10
Shri Raj Bahadur	6210—11
Shri C. Subramaniam	6211—17
Shrimati Indira Gandhi	6217—19

*The sign + marked above the name of a Member indicates that the question was actually asked on the floor of the House by him.

LOK SABHA

Monday August 22, 1966/Sravana 31, 1888 (Saka)

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

मई-जून 1966 में वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री की विदेश यात्रा

*569. श्री विभूति मिश्र :
श्री क० ना० तिवारी :
श्री विश्वनाथ पाण्डेय :
श्री किन्दर लाल :
श्री बागड़ी :
डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया :
श्री रामसेवक यादव :
श्री मधु लिमये :
श्री किशन पटनायक :
श्री मौर्य :
श्री प्र० चं० बरुआ :
श्री दलजीत सिंह :
श्रीमती सावित्री निगम :
श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय :
श्री दी० चं० शर्मा :
श्री लूटा सिंह :
श्री ओंकार लाल बेरवा :
श्री काजरोलकर :
श्री प० ह० भील :

क्या वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि उन्होंने मई और जून, 1966 में फ्रांस और अन्य देशों की यात्रा की थी ; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो इस यात्रा का क्या उद्देश्य था और उन देशों में किन विषयों पर क्या बातचीत हुई?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir, I visited France and U.K. in May—June, 1966.

(b) The purpose of the visit to Paris was to hold talks with the French Foreign Minister in pursuance of the agreement between the two countries to have regular consultations. In Paris we had a wide range discussions on the international situation and on bilateral relations.

After Paris I visited London from 3rd to 5th June to have discussions with the British Government leaders on matters of mutual interest.

श्री विभूति मिश्र : राजनीति के गूढ़ सिद्धांतों को ध्यान में रखते हुए कभी भी राजा या उसका मंत्री दूसरे देशों में तब तक नहीं जाता है जब तक कि उसको अपने राजदूत से यह पता न चले कि हमारे देश का फलां फलां हित उसके देश में जाने से होगा तो मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि मंत्री जी ने कहां तक अपने राजदूत को कंसल्ट किया था और जाने के बाद में भारत के हित में कौन कौन से काम किए गए ?

Shri Swaran Singh: The Indian Ambassador in Paris and the Indian High Commissioner in London were fully consulted before these visits to Paris and London were undertaken.

As I have indicated, we have agreed to have frequent consultations with leaders of France on matters bilateral and also on the international situation. On the last occasion, there was such a

discussion in India and this time we were invited by the French Government to have discussions in Paris.

Having gone so near the United Kingdom, I did want to have a discussion with the British leaders. Except for the last visit at the time of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference when conference matters were generally discussed, I did not have any opportunity to discuss matters, and, therefore, I undertook a three-day visit to London also.

श्री विभूति मिश्र : यह देखते हुए कि फ्रांस हमसे इनडिफरेंट है, चीन के नजदीक फ्रांस ज्यादा है और पिछली लड़ाई में इंग्लैंड हमारे खिलाफ था, तो इन बातों को ध्यान में रखते हुए हमारे मंत्री जी ने इन दोनों देशों के अधिकारियों से जो बातचीत की, उस से कहां तक वह हमारे नजदीक आये, इस में हमको कितनी सफलता मिली ?

Shri Swaran Singh: I would very strongly repel the suggestion that the French attitude towards us is indifferent. In fact, the French attitude to us is very friendly, and on various matters including the assessment of Chinese designs and Chinese policy there is a very large measure of identity between the French view and the Indian view.

It is true that our relations with the United Kingdom, particularly after the last Indo-Pakistan conflict were under considerable strain, but after the last talk that our Prime Minister had with Prime Minister Wilson in London some months ago, I did notice that there was a greater understanding of our position even in the British circles, and the talks that I had also gave me an opportunity to clarify our stand and to say categorically how we felt on certain matters.

Shri Shinkre: Clarify our stand?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, that is what he has said.

श्री क० ना० तिवारी : मंत्री महोदय ने यह कहा है कि फ्रांस और यू० के० दोनों देशों में वह गए। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि बहुत से आर्म्स अभी नागालैंड में और दूसरी जगहों में फ्रांस के पकड़े गए हैं और जो एग्रीमेंट यू० के० के साथ में हुआ था मिलिटरी सप्लाई का उस को भी अभी तक वह बन्द किए हुए हैं तो इन विषयों पर भी बातें हुई या नहीं और हुई तो इन का क्या रिजल्ट रहा ?

Shri Swaran Singh: It is true that some arms that have been captured or recovered from the Nagas are of foreign make, but I am unable to say more about it. Perhaps, my colleague, the Defence Minister who is here, may be able to throw some light on it.

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): I think I had mentioned this matter on the floor of the House that one French weapon had been found, and I had personally taken up that matter with the French Ambassador here.

श्री क० ना० तिवारी : मेरा जवाब नहीं मिला । यू० के० वाला जो मैं ने पूछा था ।

Shri Swaran Singh: I did not have any talk about military supplies because the Defence Ministry is dealing with that matter.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : पैसों की कमी और विशेषकर के विदेशी मुद्रा की कमी के कारण मैं यह सवाल पूछ रहा हूं। क्या यह सही है कि जब विदेश मंत्री जी फ्रांस में थे उसी समय यहां से एक और माननीय मंत्री कांबीना के सांस्कृतिक समझौते पर दस्तखत करने के लिए पैरिस गए और अगर यह सही है तो क्या मंत्री जी मुनासिब नहीं समझते कि ऐसा काम वहां के राजदूत ही कर डाला करें, वहां विदेश मंत्री और शिक्षा मंत्री के जाने की जरूरत नहीं है ?

Shri Swaran Singh: I have indicated that I had gone there for a

specific purpose, to have consultations about which there was an earlier agreement between the Government of France and India. It is true that some of the agreements can be signed by the ambassadors also, but the one signed by our Education Minister in Paris had special significance, and he during his visit not only signed the agreement but had very useful and important discussions about matters which are of great interest to us.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, विदेश मंत्री को एक सिद्धांत के सवाल पर जवाब देना चाहिए । यह वहां थे । अगर मान लीजिए राजदूत नहीं तो इन्होंने खुद क्यों नहीं दस्तखत किये ? इतना पैसा क्यों बरबाद किया जाता है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर । अब उन्होंने जरूरी समझा . . .

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया: तो जवाब तो होना चाहिए ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं इस में दखल नहीं दे सकता । गवर्नमेंट अगर समझती है तो गवर्नमेंट रेस्पांसिबिल है इसके लिए ।

श्री विश्वनाथ पांडेय : अभी मंत्री महोदय ने बताया है कि फ्रांस में और इंग्लैंड में जब वह गए तो वहां के विदेश मंत्री से और सरकार से अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति के विषय में भी परामर्ष किया । तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि जब वहां अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्थिति के संबंध में विचार विमर्ष किया तो पाकिस्तान जो ताशकंद समझौते की अवहेलना कर रहा है और चीन परमाणु बम बना रहा है और विस्फोट कर रहा है, क्या इस के संबंध में भी विदेश मंत्री महोदय ने परामर्ष किया और किया तो दोनों सरकारों की क्या प्रतिक्रिया रही ?

Shri Swaran Singh: Naturally both these matters which are of great importance and significance to us did come up for discussion both in Paris and in London.

श्री विश्वनाथ पाण्डेय : उन की प्रतिक्रिया क्या रही ?

Shri Swaran Singh: It is very difficult to give details of the talks.

श्री ओंकार लाल बेरवा (कोटा) : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि जो आप ने ब्रिटेन और फ्रांस की यात्रा की है, ब्रिटेन खुल्लमखुल्ला पाकिस्तान को हथियार दे रहा है और पाकिस्तान की मदद कर रहा है, तो क्या इसके बारे में भी आपने बात चीत की और की है तो क्या सारांश निकला है, उस को सामान देने के लिए हां किया है या नां किया है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह तो आ चुका है ?

Shri Swaran Singh: This has already been answered.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam: During his talks with the French Foreign Minister, did the hon. Minister make any mention about the future of the test ban treaty and nuclear free zone? If so, what was the reaction of the French Foreign Minister and the French Government?

Shri Swaran Singh: The House is, no doubt, aware that France is not a signatory to the partial nuclear test ban treaty. They are continuing to adopt this policy and have not altered it.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I am very glad that our country has arrived at an agreement with France for bilateral discussions and I was also glad that our hon. Minister visited that country recently. During his visit to France and UK, was he able to discuss a very live and burning issue which is agitating the mind of the whole world, the issue of Vietnam, and if so, what was the reaction of the French Government to the issue of Vietnam, and also the reaction of the U.K. Government to Vietnam?

Shri Swaran Singh: Vietnam was discussed both in France as well as in England, and the French assessment of the situation in Vietnam is almost identical to the assessment that we have of the Vietnam situation. The French, however, have been taking for some time the view that the present time is not an opportune time for making any worthwhile or significant peace move. The British attitude in this respect does not coincide with ours, and I took the opportunity to exchange views, but that difference of approach to the Vietnam problem between the Indian stand and the British stand remains.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: May I know in what respects the hon. Minister, during his visit to the United Kingdom found that the British Government has now got, as he said, a better appreciation of our stand during the hostilities with Pakistan? On what points did he find that the U.K. has changed its views now compared with the views it held at that time?

Shri Swaran Singh: They tried to explain the various circumstances that prevailed including the statements made by them, and we pointed out how in certain respects the attitude that they had taken was not correct, and in certain cases they admitted that they did not have before them the overall picture when they put forward certain statements.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: This is not my question. I asked on what specific matters they have changed their attitude. This is a general reply which has always been given. Why did he say this in the original statement?

Shri P. C. Borooah: May I know whether the question relating to India's relations with the European Common Market was discussed, and if so, what are the specific aspects, and with what results?

Shri Swaran Singh: This was also discussed because we had the economic expert also with us.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Could the hon. Minister appreciate and assess the obvious feeling in France like other continental countries that the Indian stand could not be appreciated better because of our relation with the Commonwealth and with the British?

Shri Swaran Singh: I think there is now greater appreciation of the position that notwithstanding our membership of the Commonwealth we look to other countries to understand their viewpoint and to explain our viewpoint.

Economic Aid Programme for Afghanistan

\+

*570. **Shri M. L. Dwivedi:**
Shri Subodh Hansda:
Shri S. C. Samanta:
Shri Madhu Limaye:
Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are considering a five-year economic aid programme for Afghanistan; and

(b) if so, when the agreement will be finalised and signed?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh): (a), No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise. However an Indian Delegation led by the Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs visited Afghanistan recently with a view to increasing technical and economic cooperation between the two countries. The Delegation finalised with the Royal Afghan Government the terms and conditions of the construction of a 100-Bed Children's Hospital in Kabul.

Other avenues of cooperation between India and Afghanistan were also explored and various requests received and suggestions made are now under examination. These include supply of agricultural equipment and implements, the deputation of experts from India, the undertaking of a survey,

the provision of training facilities in India to Afghan nationals and intensifying cultural contacts and exchanges between the two countries.

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि इस बात को ध्यान में रखते हुए कि अफगानिस्तान और भारत के बहुत मैत्रीपूर्ण सम्बन्ध हैं। वहां के विभिन्न औद्योगिक और उत्थान सम्बन्धी, प्रगति सम्बन्धी कार्यों और योजनाओं में मदद के लिये भारत सरकार क्या विशेष कदम उठा रही है और इस के लिये क्या धनराशि निर्धारित की जा रही है ?

श्री दिनेश सिंह : यही मैंने अभी निवेदन किया है। वहां पर जो डलीगेशन गया था उस ने इस सम्बन्ध में बातें की हैं। अभी हम उस स्थान पर नहीं पहुचे हैं कि तय कर सकें कि उनको क्या धन राशि की आवश्यकता है ।

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि इस डेलीगेशन में कौन-कौन से व्यक्ति गये थे, कौन-कौन सी योजनाओं पर विशेष रूप से विचार किया गया, और कितनी देर में ये फाइनल होंगी ?

श्री दिनेश सिंह : मैं ने जिक्र किया कि इस में हमारी मिनिस्ट्री के सेक्रेटरी थे, एक-एक नुमाइन्दा फाइनैन्स मिनिस्ट्री , कामर्स मिनिस्ट्री, हैल्थ मिनिस्ट्री और फूड एण्ड एग्रीकल्चर मिनिस्टरी के लोग थे। इस में कितना समय लगेगा, यह मैं अभी नहीं कह सकता ।

Shri S. C. Samanta: The Prime Minister of Afghanistan came to India on a state visit in February 1965. May I know whether this economic aid was discussed at that time and how much was to be in the form of loan and how much in the form of grant?

Shri Dinesh Singh: No discussion took place about specific amounts in the form of loan or aid; we have been discussing some projects only.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा सवाल उस समय का है, जब कि पाकिस्तान और अफगानिस्तान के सम्बन्ध बहुत बिगड़े हुए थे, पख्तूनिस्तान को लेकर और मेरी इत्तिला अफगानिस्तान के राजदूत से मिली है, जो दुर्भाग्यवश मर चुके हैं, नहीं तो उनका नाम मैं नहीं बताता । क्या यह सही है, कि व्यापार मंत्री ने अफगानिस्तान के राजदूत को अपने जवाब में बताया—

1. कि अफगानिस्तान के व्यापारी बेइमान होते हैं, तब उन्होंने कहा कि हां, सब व्यापारी बेइमान होते हैं,

2. काजू और किशमिश का व्यापार तो हमारी समाजवादी योजना से मेल नहीं खाता है और उस जमाने में जब कि पाकिस्तान और अफगानिस्तान के सम्बन्ध बिगड़े हुए थे, अफगानिस्तान के बहुत से व्यापारियों का दिवाला निकल रहा था,

अगर यह बात सही है तो क्या विदेश मंत्री व्यापार मंत्री को हिदायत देगें कि अफगानिस्तान और भारत के व्यापार में खाली व्यापार को नुक्ता नहीं, बल्कि विदेशी सम्बन्धों को भी नुक्ता रखना जरूरी है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह ट्रेड का सवाल नहीं है ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : व्यापार सम्बन्धी जितनी भी योजनायें मदद देने की हैं, उन से सम्बन्ध रखता है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह इकोनोमिक एड का सवाल है आप ट्रेड का सवाल ले रहे हैं ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आर्थिक मदद से सम्बन्ध रखता है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं आर्थिक मदद से सम्बन्ध नहीं रखता । स्वामी जी ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अब आप विचार कीजिये

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस वक्त यह संबंध इस पर नहीं आना चाहिये ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : यह उसी आर्थिक मदद से सम्बन्ध रखता है, क्योंकि इसके बिना अफगानिस्तान का आर्थिक ढांचा बिगड़ जाता है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप इसको रहने दीजिये ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : इस को इस ढंग से देखिये न, अफगानिस्तान का कोई भी समुद्री साधन नहीं है ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि सरकार जो अफगानिस्तान को सहायता के सम्बन्ध में विचार कर रही है, तो अब से पहले वह कितनी धनराशि सहायता के रूप में उसको दे चुकी है, कितनी बार दे चुकी है और पाकिस्तान तथा हिन्दुस्तान के युद्ध के समय अफगानिस्तान सरकार का क्या दृष्टिकोण रहा है ?

श्री दिनेश सिंह : सहायता के रूप में कोई खास धनराशि की बात मैंने नहीं कही है । मैं ने पहले अर्ज किया था कि जो खास प्रोजेक्ट्स हैं उनकी तरफ हम देखते है, कई प्रोग्राम्ज हैं, उन में हम कुछ देते हैं, जैसे आई०टी०ई०सी० प्रोग्राम के अन्तर्गत टेकनीकल एसिस्टेंस दी जाती है, इन के अलावा कोलम्बो प्लान की स्कीमों में मदद देते हैं, अब इनकी पूरी धन राशि का विवरण इस समय मेरे पास नहीं है ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान के युद्ध के समय उनका दृष्टिकोण क्या था ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह दृष्टिकोण आपको मालूम है ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : अध्यक्ष महोदय मेरे इस प्रश्न का उत्तर दिलाइये ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इसका इकानामिक एड से सम्बन्ध मत जोड़िये ।

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: Apart from taking a decision as to what amount will be given as aid or as grant, has the basic approach to the problem been decided by now, that is to say, whether the economic aid to that country which is a backward country will depend upon collaboration from this country, or it will be giving them some knowhow of development and some of our own machinery and other things?

Shri Dinesh Singh: I mentioned in the body of my reply that it will include all these things: training of personnel here, sending technicians there, giving them financial assistance if we work out joint projects. All, these will be there.

Shri Shinkre: Economic aid between two countries can consist of two forms; Government to Government level as well as private-to-private level. In this connection, the difficulty that is being experienced is the visa restriction for travel and transit between Afghanistan and India. When there is no such restriction even between Afghanistan and Pakistan, will the Government consider the immediate urgency of doing away with these visa restrictions for travel and transit between these two countries and establish or introduce some easier method just like coupons or identity cards and boost the economic aid?

Shri Dinesh Singh: Economic collaboration is not necessarily linked up with visa as such. Of course, if there are no restrictions movement can take place more easily, but we have not experienced any difficulty on this account.

Shri Shinkre: You have not, but the people have.

Firing on Voters by Naga Rebels

+

*571. **Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:**
Shri M. L. Dwivedi:
Shri S. C. Samanta:
Shri Subodh Hansda:
Shrimati Savitri Nigam:
Shri Maurya:
Shri Bagri:
Shri S. M. Banerjee:
Shri Krishnapal Singh:
Shri Hukam Chand Kachhavaiya:
Shri Sonavane:
Shri Raghunath Singh:
Shri Bibhuti Mishra:
Shrimati Renuka Barkataki:
Shri Tula Ram:
Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:
Shri Ram Harkh Yadav:
Shri Braj Bihari Mehrotra:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether underground Nagas had warned the people of four constituencies in Nagaland to refrain from casting their votes in the bye-election to the Nagaland Legislative Assembly in the months of May and June;

(b) whether they threatened the villagers through intimidating letters;

(c) whether this was followed up by an attack on the polling booth by the armed Naga hostiles; and

(d) if so, the details of the incident and the action taken in the matter?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh): (a) According to information received by Government the underground Nagas tried to persuade the villagers generally not to participate in the bye-elections. A total of 13 constituencies was involved but polling took place in only 4 constituencies, as candidates from other constituencies were returned unopposed.

(b) There is no definite evidence of such action though it cannot be ruled out.

(c) and (d). In Chichema (District Kohima) underground Nagas opened fire from a considerable distance. Our security forces returned the fire; there were no casualties. There was no report of any other incident at any other place where polling was held during the bye-elections. Roughly 50 per cent of the voters participated in the elections.

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : क्या सरकार ने यह अनुमान लगाया है कि इन उपचुनावों में 50 प्रतिशत: मतदाता जो चुनाव केन्द्रों पर नहीं आ सके वह इसलिये नहीं आ सके कि उन में से अधिकांश को मतदान केन्द्रों पर आने से रोका गया ?

वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य-मंत्री (श्री दिनेश सिंह) : यह कहना कठिन है क्योंकि यहां भी जो चुनाव होते हैं उन में भी कोई 100 फ़ी सदी वोटर्स आते हैं ऐसी बात तो नहीं है लेकिन हो सकता है कि कुछ लोगों को रोकने के लिए दबाव भी डाला गया हो लेकिन हम ने पूरी कोशिश की थी कि जो लोग वहां पर मतदान देने आयेंगे उन की वहां पर सुरक्षा की व्यवस्था हो और उन्हें कोई दिक्कत न हो ?

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : क्या अभी हाल की वार्ताओं में यह बात उन से स्पष्ट कर ली गई है कि मतदान ऐसे आवश्यक कार्य में विद्रोही नागा रुकावट न डालें । और क्या इस पर उन्होंने अपनी सहमति दी है कि ऐसे कार्यों में जब कि वार्ता का यह दौर उन के और प्रधान मंत्री के बीच चल रहा है तो वह ऐसे कार्यों में रुकावट नहीं डालेंगे ?

श्री दिनेश सिंह : इस के सम्बन्ध में यहां तो वार्ता में कोई बात नहीं उठी लेकिन जब यह चुनाव होने जा रहे थे तो जो वहां पर छिपे हुए नागा हैं उन के बीच में और डिस्ट्रिक्ट ऐथारिटीज के बीच में एक समझौता हो गया था और उन्होंने कहा था कि वे रुकावट नहीं डालेंगे।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि पोलिंग स्टेशंस पर जहां कि वोटस लिये जा रहे थे क्या वहां पोलिंग स्टेशंस पर किसी प्रकार का असर व दबाव वोटर्स पर इन विद्रोही नागाओं की तरफ़ से डाला गया था ?

श्री विनेश सिंह : जी नहीं, ऐसी तो कोई सूचना नहीं मिली है ।

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : जैसा कि मंत्री महोदय ने बतलाया कि जो लोग वोट डालने आना चाहते हैं उन की सुरक्षा का प्रबन्ध सरकार की ओर से किया जाता है लेकिन मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि जो लोग वोट डाल कर लौट जाते हैं उनकी बाद की सुरक्षा का प्रबन्ध भी क्या कोई सरकार ने सोचा है कि जो लोग वोट डाल कर लौटेंगे और उन की जान व माल को कोई खतरा हो तो उस की सुरक्षा की व्यवस्था होवे ?

श्री विनेश सिंह : इस की व्यवस्था तो पूरे नागालैंड की सुरक्षा की व्यवस्था है ।

श्री विभूति मिश्र : अभी मंत्री महोदय ने अपने उत्तर में बतलाया कि चिचेमा में अंडरग्राउन्ड नागाज ने फायरिंग की । इस समय प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहबा बैठी हुई हैं तो मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि जो उन नागा लीडर्स से बातचीत हो रही है उस में वोटिंग में फायरिंग जैसी चीज का भी जिक्र हुआ है क्योंकि इस तरह की हरकतें करके नागा लोग मूल सिद्धान्त का ही विरोध कर रहे हैं ?

श्री विनेश सिंह : जी नहीं मैं ने अभी अर्ज किया कि उस की बात तो नहीं हुई लेकिन वहां यह तय हो गया था कि ऐसा नहीं करेंगे केवल एक जगह ऐसी बात हुई है ।

Shri S. C. Samanta: Is Government aware that before the election took place, some hostile Naga agents were propagating in these areas and they were not arrested? Is it true?

Shri Dinesh Singh: They were propagating, and I think they had also written some letters to others.

Shri Hem Barua: In view of the fact that the so-called cease-fire agreement stipulates that no party, neither the Indian party nor the Naga party, would ever take recourse to arms and as the Minister has just now admitted that they had taken recourse to arms, may I know whether the Government do not think that this is a clear violation of the so-called cease-fire agreement? If the Government do think so, why is it that the Prime Minister has not brought this matter specifically to the notice of the underground leaders when they saw her recently in Delhi?

Shri Dinesh Singh: I tried to point out that bye-elections are taking place in a number of constituencies. There had been an agreement between the parties that the underground would not disturb them. Firing took place in one. It is very difficult to say who were the people who fired, but the fire was returned. It is certainly a violation, but we felt that it was not such a big matter that it should be taken up, because it did not materially affect the elections.

Shri Hem Barua: On a point of order, Sir. I wanted to know whether the Government tried to do it or not and the reply was "we are trying to do it". Whatever that might be, the Minister says this is not a big matter. I say it is a big matter since it is a violation of the cease-fire agreement between the two parties. Even Mr. Angami, the new Chief Minister, has said recently that there has been no violation of the cease-fire agreement. But my information is this and that has been corroborated by the Minister that they took recourse to firing and there had been firing.

Mr. Speaker: Whatever else it may be, it is not a point of order.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam: While replying to a supplementary by Mr. Samantha, the Minister mentioned that the Naga rebels were not only misguiding the people, but also they have written letters to the voters not to vote. May I know how many such people who were going around misguiding the people were arrested by the Government?

Mr. Speaker: He has answered it already.

Shri Dinesh Singh: I said, we have not arrested.

Shri P. C. Borooah: From the pace of military preparation that of Naga hostiles are carrying on with the help of the Chinese and Pakistanis and in view of their taking recourse to firing on voters going to the polls, do the Government think that a large number of Naga hostiles are not in favour of continuing any negotiations for a settlement within the framework of the Indian Constitution? May I know what drastic steps Government propose to take to put down the activities of the Naga hostiles?

Shri Dinesh Singh: No, sir; it is not the assessment of the Government that a large number of people do not want a peaceful solution. On the other hand, we feel that a large number of people do want a peaceful solution.

भारत-पाकिस्तान संघर्ष के बारे में अमरीकी प्रतिरक्षा सचिव का वक्तव्य

+

*572. **श्री सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद :**
श्री प्र० चं० बरुआ :

क्या वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या उनका ध्यान सीनेट विदेश सम्बन्धी समिति के समक्ष अमरीकी प्रतिरक्षा सचिव श्री मैकनमारा द्वारा दिये गये इस आशय के वक्तव्य की ओर दिलाया गया है कि भारत पाकिस्तान संघर्ष बुनियादी तौर पर हिन्दू मुस्लिम संघर्ष था ;

(ख) क्या उनका ध्यान उन के इस वक्तव्य की ओर भी दिलाया गया है कि संघर्ष अमरीका के दबाव के परिणाम स्वरूप ही समाप्त हुआ था ; और

(ग) यदि हां, तो इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार की क्या प्रतिक्रिया है ?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) and (b). Yes, Sir.

(c) We were naturally surprised at Mr. McNamara's statement and took up the matter with U.S. Authorities in Washington and with U.S. Ambassador in New Delhi.

We consider that the views expressed by the U.S. Defence Secretary are his personal views and not the views of the U.S. Government.

श्री सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद : क्या वैदेशिक कार्य मंत्री से मैं यह जान सकता हूं कि न केवल श्री मैक्नमारा ने एक ऐसा वक्तव्य दिया जिससे भारत पाकिस्तान सम्बन्धों पर बहुत असर पड़ सकता है बल्कि ऐसी सूचना भी प्रकाश में आई है कि उस के पीछे अमरीकी सरकार की सूचना का ही आधार नहीं था बल्कि ऐसी सूचना भी मिली है कि सी० आई० ए० ने पाकिस्तान को भारत पर हमला करने के लिए भड़काया और उस की योजना बनाई, यदि ये बातें सच हैं तो इस सम्बन्ध में भारत सरकार ने अमरीका सरकार का ध्यान इस ओर खींचने के लिए क्या किया और अमरीकी सरकार की क्या प्रतिक्रिया रही ?

Shri Swaran Singh: With regard to the two points mentioned in (a) and (b), I have clarified the position that he did make that statement and we took up the matter with him. I could not follow the hon. member. Is he

suggesting anything beyond what is mentioned in (a) and (b) of his question?

श्री सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद: श्रीमन् मैं ने यह सवाल पूछा था कि श्री मैकनमारा ने जो वक्तव्य दिया जिस से भारत पाकिस्तान सम्बन्धों पर बहुत बुरा असर पड़ सकता है उस के पीछे अमरीकी सरकार की सूचना थी या आधार नहीं था बल्कि ऐसी सूचना मिली है कि सी० आई० ए० ने पाकिस्तान को भारत पर हमला करने के लिए भड़काया, उसकी योजना बनाई, यदि ये बातें सच हैं तो इस सम्बन्ध में भारत सरकार ने अमरीकी सरकार का ध्यान इस ओर खींचने के लिए क्या किया और अमरीकी सरकार की क्या प्रतिक्रिया रही ?

Shri Swaran Singh: I do not accept the presumption upon which the question is based. We have no information that there was any hand of any foreign power in this unfortunate conflict between the two countries.

Shri P. C. Borooah: Do Government agree with the view expressed by the U.S. Defence Secretary that the only basis of re ationship of Pakistan with China is Pakistan's dispute with India on the Kashmir issue; if so, may I know what steps Government have taken to dispel this idea from the mind of the U.S. Government?

Shri Swaran Singh: We do not accept any such view and, as I have said on all these issues, when we took it up with the U.S. Government we came to the conclusion that this is not the U.S. Government's view.

Shri P. C. Borooah: I want to know what steps Government have taken to dispel this idea from the mind of the U.S. Government.

Shri Swaran Singh: The statements that are made here, on the floor of this House and also outside, are the greatest contradiction of any such feeling that might prevail anywhere.

Dr. Ranen Sen: Sir, a little while ago the hon. Minister said that Mr. McNamara made this statement on his own and it was not the view of the U.S. Government.

Shri Shinkere: That is what we consider, he said.

Dr. Ranen Sen: Then he said, after making enquiries from the U.S. Government he got the impression or the Ministry of External Affairs got the impression that that was not the view of the U.S. Government. May I know, when this Government got this impression, did the Government make positive enquiries from the U.S. Government to know what was their reaction to the statement made by Mr. McNamara?

Shri Swaran Singh: The reaction was what was conveyed to us, that they accept that India is a secular country and there is no question of any conflict between Hindus and Muslims being the main cause of conflict between India and Pakistan.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: There are two questions pertaining to this. May I know whether the U.S. Government has made it absolutely clear to them that it was not because of their pressure but because of our own free will that the cessation of hostilities was there and that this vitiating view about the Hindu-Muslim business, which is not only the individual McNamara view but the view that is prevalent there—is the view which is being given all the colour, whereas the U.S. Government's clear view is just to the contrary?

Shri Swaran Singh: The U.S. Government knows fully well that there was not question of exercise of any pressure on us in the matter of economic aid, and we on our side have never been influenced by any such consideration. At the time when the conflict ended, as the House knows, there were proposals made by the.... (*Interruptions*). We know, we responded to the call of the Secretary-

General and of the Security Council for ending hostilities, and this point that was expressed here, we have very strongly told them that this is unfounded and it is not correct. On the other issue, I have already ventured to point out that the real conflict between India and Pakistan is not the conflict between Hindus and Muslims as was sought to be projected in the statement to which reference has been made in part (a) of the question. We have ourselves explained the thing quite categorically and clearly and the U.S. Government representatives also have accepted the view that they accept that India is a secular country and there is no question of any conflict between Hindus and Muslims.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Mr. Speaker, Mr. McNamara is not a private individual. When the question of military pressure arises, he has given this evidence as Secretary for Defence. Let us understand it. Therefore, the Government of USA owes an explanation and an apology to this house and to this country. May I know whether in response to our raising this matter they have clearly repudiated? it What their general view formerly was—is another matter. Mr. McNamara as Defence Secretary has said this before a Committee of the Senate. And you from this Government have taken up this matter with the US Government. On both questions or views may we know whether, in response to what you have stated, the Government of USA have expressed their regret, and have given an explanation regarding both the issues? What have they to say?

Shri Swaran Singh: When we took it up with the Government there, their Deputy Assistant Secretary said that they will accept the view that India was an entirely secular country. In a matter like this.... (*Interruptions*)

An hon. Member: That is not the question.

Shri Swaran Singh: It shouuld be appreciated that this was a certain interpretation that one of the members of their Government put to historical events, which we strongly reject and repudiate. We have expressed our viewpoint. After an official of their Government had conveyed to us the view that they have about the Indian attitude, I think we should leave the matter at that, because I do not think we can expect they will formally repudiate such a statement.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Has any serious assessment been made to what extent this statement represents a high-level ignorance in official circles in the United States and to what extent the inefficiency and ineffectivily of our Embassy and Missions in the United States in the field of public relations. publicity and propaganda, as compared to the Pakistani efforts, is a contributory factor?

Shri Swaran Singh: I do not think that publicity effort or propaganda has got much to do with it. They have got a Mission here and we have got a Mission in the United States. We are constantly in touch with each other and we convey our views. I myself took it up with the United States Ambassador and he told me quite clearly that this view is not the view of the United States Government.

Shri Ranga: The American publicity offices established in India are impressing upon us the important role that Mr. McNamara plays in the American Government. The Span magazine has recently published his biographical sketch, appreciating the role played by him. In the light of it, is it tenable for the Government to consider his statement in such a non-serious fashion as they seem to have done? Have the Government taken any special steps, through their Ambassador and otherwise, to approach the President of American, Mr. Johnson, and make him aware of the strong resentment felt by the Government of India, and try to elicit any assuaging expression from him to indicate that the United States Government would change their attitude, would change their view

on this matter and try not to insult India in this fashion?

Shri Swaran Singh: I would like to assure the hon. Member and the House that we do consider it as a very serious matter and we attach very great importance to it. It is for this reason that I myself sent for the United States Ambassador and had a very frank talk with him. After his assurance that this was not the view of the United States Government....

Shri Ranga: What about the US President?

Shri Swaran Singh: I do not recollect taking up this matter with the United States President. Anyhow, it is a suggestion for action.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: May I know, in the first place, whether the Government or its envoys have made any specific effort to re-educate Mr. McNamara about his view that this was a Hindu-Muslim conflict? Was this taken up with him, in view of the fact that he holds a high and responsible office in the United States Government? The second question is one of fact, and the statement relates to actual pressure having been applied by the United States Government and that pressure constituting the only factor which brought about this settlement. The Government must elucidate a very categorical clarification from the United States Government and then come to this House.

Shri Swaran Singh: I am not able to say as to whether this matter was taken up with Mr. McNamara personally. I will check that up. I do not want to make a statement without any information.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: It should have been done.

Shri Swaran Singh: Yes. As to this pressure, we know fully well and they also know, although he said so, that it is a fact that there was no question of any economic pressure.

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah: In view of the deep resentment of the remarks made by a responsible minister, like the Minister of Defence, Mr. McNamara, may I know whether this Government proposes to take up the matter and impress upon the US Government to come out with an open repudiation saying that that is not the view of the American Government and that it is only his personal view?

Shri Swaran Singh: I also share the resentment which has been mentioned by the hon.Member. We have already taken that up. The second part is a suggestion for action. We shall consider that also.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: It should be should be taken up again. It has been ineffective so far.

श्री यशपाल सिंह : क्या विदेश मंत्री जी का ध्यान इस ओर गया है कि पाकिस्तान जो कुछ अमरीका से कहलवाना चाहता है वह अमरीका कहता है ? क्या माननीय विदेश मंत्री कोई ऐसी मिसाल पेश करेंगे कि अभी तक आपके हक में अमरीका ने कोई बयान दिया है ?

Shri Swaran Singh: It is too general a statement. I do not think the United States says everything that Pakistan wants it to say.

Shri Hem Barua: From our side the defence of our territorial integrity against the Pakistani aggression of 1965 was a national effort but do not Government think that from what the Pakistani leaders, including President Ayub Khan and Mr. Bhutto, have said—they have made statements against the Hindus of India—judging from the statements made by the Pakistani leaders periodically against the Hindus of India, this aggression by Pakistan during 1965 of India was nothing but a communal affair from their side?

Shri Tyagi: Supported by Patton tanks.

Shri Swaran Singh: It was an act of aggression and the communal

frenzy also was raised by the Pakistani leaders to infuriate their masses. We are fully conscious of this concept of jehand and the like which the Pakistani leaders raised on that occasion. It was by our determination and urge to highlight our unity and our secular character that we could face this successfully as, I have no doubt, we faced it successfully on the last occasion.

Widening of Kasur Nallah by Pakistan

+

*574. **Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:**
Shri Hukam Chand Kachhavaiya:
Shri Raghunath Singh:
Shri D. C. Sharma:

Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Pakistan is widening Kasur Nallah which flows into Pakistan from India and runs along the border on Pakistan side and is also raising the height of its banks; and

(b) if so, the reaction of Government thereto?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) and (b). Pakistan is carrying out improvements and construction work to enhance the utility of the Kasur Nallah from the military point of view. Government have taken note of this development.

श्री विश्वनाथ पाण्डेय : मंत्री महोदय ने बताया है कि सैनिक दृष्टिकोण से पाकिस्तान उस नाले को चौड़ा कर रहा है या बना रहा है । मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि जब भारत का बटवारा हुआ था तब क्या कसूर नाले के सम्बन्ध में भी पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान में कोई समझौता हुआ था, यदि हुवा था तो क्या हुआ था ?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): What exactly the agreement was, I have no information about that. Naturally, we have taken note of the latest developments from the military point of view and it is on this basis that this particular information has been given. We have taken note of the widening of Kasur Nallah. Also, there is a possibility of development of a parallel road along with that and we have certainly taken note of that.

श्री विश्वनाथ पाण्डेय : कसूर नाले का सामरिक महत्व भारत और पाकिस्तान दोनों के लिए है, दोनों के लिए यह नाला विशेष स्थान रखता है । मैं जानना चाहता हू कि पाकिस्तान इस नाले को कब से चौड़ा कर रहा है और कब से वह सामरिक महत्व के सामान से उस स्थान को सुदृढ़ कर रहा है ? सरकार ने इसके सम्बन्ध में जो यह बताया है कि उस के पास नोट लिख कर भेज दिया गया है, मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि पाकिस्तान सरकार की क्या प्रतिक्रिया हुई है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नोट नहीं लिख दिया है , उन्होंने कहा है "टेकन नोट" ।

Shri Y. B. Chavan: We have noticed this latest development after the cessation of hostilities last year. This is the latest development.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : अभी मंत्री महोदय ने बताया है कि पाकिस्तान के इरादे कुछ सड़कें बनाने के भी हैं । क्या यह बात सही है कि उसने सड़कें बनाना प्रारम्भ कर दिया है और उसने उस क्षेत्र में सैनिक तैयारियां भी कर रखी हैं ! यदि हां, तो उन तैयारियों को देखते हुए हम ने भी इस कसूर नाले के किनारे या निकट कोई ऐसी तैयारी कर रखी है जिससे समय आने पर हम तुरन्त पाकिस्तान का मुकाबला कर सकें ?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I have said that we have taken note of this and we have also to make a preparation.

Shri D. C. Sharma: The Indus Water Treaty was entered into by our Government and the Pakistan Government. I think, that probably had a look at all the rivers that flow in our country and in Pakistan. May I know if this Kasur Nallah was mentioned—so far as I remember, I think, it was mentioned—in the Indus Water Treaty and, if so, what was the specific suggestion made about this Kasur Nallah on account of its irrigation potentiality and on account of its strategic importance.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: As far as irrigation facilities are concerned, I have not got information on the basis of that Agreement just now. But, certainly, one point that should be taken note of is that there was some provision about inspection of any developments and we have, on behalf of the Indus Water Commission, made a demand for inspection of developments on the other side.

श्री जगदेव सिंह सिद्धान्ती : क्या मंत्री महोदय यह बताने का कष्ट करेंगे कि कसूर नाले के साथ साथ वर्तमान जो पाकिस्तान के साथ युद्ध हुआ था उसका प्रभाव हमारे क्षेत्र पर पड़ा था और वह प्रभाव न केवल पंजाब बल्कि राजस्थान की सीमा के साथ भी गया था ? यदि हां तो इन दोनों बातों को ध्यान में रखते हुए भारत सरकार ने क्या कोई ऐसी योजना बनाई है जिससे कि उनकी तरफ से आक्रमण होने की यदि आशंका हो तो फिर से उसी प्रकार से उनको कुचल सकें !

Shri Y. B. Chavan: It is a general question and I can say that military experts have taken note of developments made on the other side and, certainly, we will examine the question of any necessity of permanent preparations of this type and certain decisions have been taken in this particular matter. I will not be able to go into the details of it in the public interest.

श्री गुलशन : क्या यह सच नहीं है है कि कसूर नाले के साथ साथ सुलेमान की हैडवर्क्स पर भी पाकिस्तानी फौजों ने खंदकें खोदी हैं ! यदि खोदी है तो क्या सरकार के ध्यान में यह बात आई है ?

श्री यशवन्तराव चह्वाण : आई है ।

Situation in Nagaland

*575. **Dr. L. M. Singhvi:** Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether a Conference was held under the Chairmanship of the Prime Minister in order to review the situation in Nagaland and particularly to discuss measures to strengthen the administration in Nagaland on the 19th May, 1966;

(b) if so, the conclusions of the Conference, if any; and

(c) the steps taken to implement the same?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh): (a) The Prime Minister held some discussions with the Governor and Chief Minister of Assam and some of her colleagues in the course of which the situation in Nagaland was also discussed among other matters.

(b) and (c). The deliberations were of a confidential nature and it would not be desirable to disclose them or the follow up action taken.

डा० लक्ष्मीमल्ल सिंघवी : क्या इस सम्मेलन के समय इस बात से सरकार को अवगत किया गया है कि नागा विद्रोही नागालैंड के लोकमानस को माइकल स्काट और फिजो की प्रेतछाया से अवरुद्ध और भयभीत कर रहे हैं ? यदि ऐसा है तो सरकार ने क्या आर्थिक या दूसरे कदम इस विषय में उठाये हैं ?

श्री दिनेश सिंह : दिक्कत यह है कि मैं अगर कहूं कि क्या बातें हुई या क्या कहीं तो आगे उसमें बातें उठ

जाती हैं । मैंने अभी अर्ज किया है कि जो बातें हुई थीं उनको बताने में मैं मजबूर हूं ।

डा० लक्ष्मीमल्लसिंघवी : क्या इस सम्मेलन के निश्चयों की बाबत और दूसरे मामलों में इसके उपरान्त वहां के वर्तमान मुख्य मंत्री श्री अंगामी प्रधान मंत्री से मिले हैं और मिल कर उन्होंने नागालैंड की मुख्य समस्याओं से अवगत कराया है और विशेषतया वहां के लिए बड़े आर्थिक कार्यक्रम के लिए उनकी सिफारिश की है ।

श्री दिनेश सिंह : श्री अंगामी अभी दिल्ली में हैं वह प्रधान मंत्री जी से मिले हैं और हम लोगों से भी बातें कर रहे हैं ।

Shri Hem Barua: In the context of the latest change of Chief Ministership in Nagaland—Mr. Shilu Ao has yielded place to Mr. Angami and Mr. Angami happens to be a friend of Mr. Phizo—do Government think that the change of Chief Ministership in Nagaland is likely to contribute to restoration of peace so far as underground Nagas are concerned?

Shri Dinesh Singh: The change of Chief Ministership is a matter for the Nagaland Assembly to decide. They have changed the Chief Minister. I do not think that it will make much difference on our relations with underground Nagas.

Shri Hem Barua: May I submit that the report is that Mr. Phizo is maintaining contact with Mr. Angami and Rev. Michael Scott is also maintaining contact with Mr. Angami. Therefore, I am interested in knowing whether his having become the Chief Minister of Nagaland would improve the situation.

Mr. Speaker: The Assembly there has changed the Chief Minister. What can Government do?

Next Question.

Statement of US Defence Secretary Regarding Containment of China

*576. **Shri Shree Narayan Das:** Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the attention of Government has been drawn to a statement, in a prepared speech of American Defence Secretary, Mr. Robert McNamara, to a meeting of American Society of Newspaper Editors about containment of China;

(b) whether the implications of the statement that "Nations that believed it was in their common interest to deter the expansion of China's economic and political control beyond its national boundaries must take a more active role in guarding the defence perimeter" has been studied; and

(c) if so, the reaction of Government thereto?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) and (b). Yes, Sir.

(c) The Government of India are totally opposed to Chinese expansionism and are determined to resist the Chinese threat to our freedom and integrity. They, however, are convinced of the validity of India's basic foreign policy of non-alignment and avoidance of military alliances.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: May I know whether there is any truth in the fact that there is a feeling among some of the South-East Asian countries which are likely to be affected by the Chinese policy of expansionism that India views this question of Chinese expansionism only in the context of invasion from China into the Himalayan areas and, if it is so, what steps are being taken by the Government to remove this impression from the minds of those countries?

Shri Swaran Singh: It is quite natural and we should not be apologetic about it because our main interest is on account of our conflict with China in NEFA and in Ladakh. About the general policy of China, I have already indicated my view that

we are opposed to it. But let us not, under this feeling, give up our policy of rejecting the so-called Defence pacts as an effective means of resisting this threat.

Shri Shree Narayan Das: May I know whether those countries which are likely to be affected by the Chinese expansionism in South-East Asia have taken up this question to deter the Chinese expansion in this area and, if so, what is the attitude of this Government in this regard?

Shri Swaran Singh: The hon. Member must be aware that some countries in South East Asia have got certain defence pacts and certain collective security arrangements and they, in their wisdom, think that that is in their best national interest. Similarly we are also entitled to take the view that the pursuit of the policy that India is at the moment following, namely, the policy of non-alignment and of not being members of any pact, is the correct policy from our point of view.

Shri Joachim Alva: Have we drawn the attention of the U.S. Government, not once but repeatedly, to the disastrous policy which they have followed by which the entire peace of the subcontinent of India has been disturbed, namely, the massive retaliation policy of Mr. Dulles by which they armed Pakistan to the teeth and they have finally brought the Chinese at our door-step? Have the Government impressed this fact on them that by stopping to arm Pakistan, they can restore peace here, so that South East Asia will have peace?

Shri Swaran Singh: I am not sure whether this question arises out of the present question.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. D. C. Sharma.

Shri D. C. Sharma: The hon. Defence Minister of the U.S.A. talked of defence perimeter and as such all nations should strive to contain China and to strengthen that defence perimeter. May I know if the External Affairs Ministry have brought it to the notice of the Defence Minister or the U.S. Government that the defence perimeter consists not only of the Soviet Union—because they have a common defence perimeter with China—or of India but also of Pakistan, and what efforts the U.S. Government are making in order that that part of the defence perimeter which is with Pakistan is guarded properly by the U.S.A.?

Shri Swaran Singh: I do not think that I am competent to advice the United States Government about the measures that they should take to defend Pakistan, as was suggested by the hon. Member, if I have understood the question put by the hon. Member, correctly....

Shri D. C. Sharma: I am sorry my question has not been understood correctly. My question was not about the measures that they should take to defend Pakistan. My question was this. The defence perimeter of China extends to the border of the Soviet Union; it extends to the border between India and China and it extends also to the border between China and Pakistan. Has it been brought to the notice of the United States Government that while they are following this policy of containment of the defence perimeter, they will ask the Pakistan Government also to see to it that they guard themselves against China?

Shri Swaran Singh: It is true that at one time the United States Government and Pakistan had entered into some of these pacts such as the SEATO pact and the Baghdad Pact as it was then called. Then, Pakistan and the United States had the mutual defence security agreement also and under that pretext Pakistan got massive military aid from the United States and misled the United States Government that they were likely to use it to defend themselves against China, whereas in actual practice what we had been saying has turned to be correct namely that Pakistan was acquiring all these arms in order that they might be used against India, and they actually have used them on more than one occasion.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: I would like the hon. Minister to clarify this point further, namely whether Government consider that it is the right of Mr. MacNamara, or any other member of the United States Government for that matter, to include India among the nations which constitute the defence perimeter of the United States, as is implied in this statement which has been quoted in the main question namely that:

> Mr. MacNamara referred to the defence perimeter which all nations should be more active in guarding.....

Do Government consider that India can also be given the doubtful honour of being included in the defence perimeter of the United States?

Shri Swaran Singh: No; I do not think so; why should we think that we can be given that doubtful honour? Our view is that India is not mentioned in the statement of Mr. MacNamara.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: He has not excluded it either.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Has the attention of Government been drawn to the warning sounded by the Japanese Prime Minister Mr. Sato as well as by the former Prime Minister of Japan, Mr. Kishi, against the menace of China, and their calling upon all Asian democracies to join in collective action, not necessarily military, and if so, do Government propose to join other democracies of Asia and the world in a call for a global defence of democracy?

Shri Swaran Singh: We have no such plan of joining any global defence of democracy, and I am not aware of any such idea.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The Japanese Prime Minister had said so....

Mr. Speaker: The question hour is over. Now, we shall take up the short notice question.

12.00 hrs.

Short Notice Question

Dock Labourers at Cochin Harbour

S.N.Q. 14. Shri Maniyangadan: Will the Minister of **Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware that the dock labourers at Cochin Harbour have adopted a "go slow" policy causing great delay in getting berths for and loading of steamers, exporting cashew kernels and other goods;

(b) whether steamers had to wait for getting berths and if so, how many such instances have occurred;

(c) whether any ship had to omit call at Cochin and if so, how many ships have done so; and

(d) the steps being taken to stop this "go slow" policy of the dock labourers?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Shri Shahnawaz Khan): (a) Yes.

(b) Yes. 62 such instances during July, 1966.

(c) Yes, three ships.

(d) Disciplinary action is being taken in certain cases.

Shri Maniyangadan: Has any specific demand been put forward by the labourers or their organisations? If so, what are they?

Shri Shahnawaz Khan: From the report of the Chairman of the Port Trust, we learn that the real cause of the trouble was that certain gangs were asking for what is known as 'ghost money', that is illegal gratification for doing the normal work. What actually led to all this trouble.

Shri Maniyangadan: It is a long time since this policy of go-slow was adopted by the labourers, and several representations were made to the Chairman of the Dock Labour Board. Has he taken any steps in the matter to see that things are settled?

Shri Shahnawaz Khan: The Chairman of the Port Trust held a meeting of all the interested parties. The House will be very glad to learn that even the labour unions have extended full co-operation in fighting this evil of 'ghost money'. Things have already improved as a result of the action taken.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Recently, there was a threat of an all-India strike by the Port and Dock Labourers and I believe there was some meeting with their representatives on an all-India level and there was some settlement. In spite of this settlement, no actual benefit had been conferred even in terms of interim benefit, in view of which there is a lot of resentment and frustration among the workers. What is Government going to do in the matter of giving some relief to them?

Shri Shahnawaz Khan: This is a separate question.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: This concerns dock labour.

Shri Shahnawaz Khan: I may inform the hon. Member that the Wage Board is already going into the matter and is seized of the problem.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Has Government set in motion the conciliation machinery and ascertained the exact grievances of the workmen? Also, have the workmen started asking for these rights all of a sudden without any provocation and any basis?

Shri Shahnawaz Khan: The case is not before the conciliation machinery because neither side has approached it.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Explosion of Mines in Areas Evacuated by Pakistan

*577. **Shri Madhu Limaye:**
Shri Kishen Pattnayak:
Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia:
Shri Hukam Chand Kachhavaiya:
Shri Rameshwaranand:
Shri Raghunath Singh:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received any reports about the deaths resulting from explosions of mines and bombs in areas evacuated by Pakistan in terms of the Tashkent agreement up-to-date;

(b) whether the Government of Pakistan and India entered into an agreement about de-mining these areas before evacuation or exchanging information about the mines and bombs not removed before evacuation; and

(c) if not, the reasons for the same?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) Does not arise.

वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्रालय से नागालैण्ड के विषय का हस्तान्तरण

*578. श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री :
श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :
श्री रघुनाथ सिंह :
श्री जगदेव सिंह सिद्धान्ती :
श्री हु० चा० लिंग रेड्डी :
श्री प्र० रं० चक्रवर्ती :

क्या प्रधान मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि

(क) 'नागालैण्ड के प्रशासन' के विषय को अभी तक वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्रालय से गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय को हस्तान्तरित न किये जा सकने के क्या कारण हैं; और

(ख) इसके बारे में अन्तिम निर्णय कब किया जायेगा ?

प्रधान मंत्री तथा अणु शक्ति मंत्री (श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी): (क) और (ख). अतारांकित प्रश्न संख्या 482 के उत्तर में 21 फरवरी, 1966 को लोक सभा में मैंने

पहले ही बता दिया था कि सरकार ने सिद्धान्त रूप में स्वीकार कर लिया है कि नागालैण्ड विषयक मामले गृह-मंत्रालय द्वारा अधिक समुचित रूप से प्रशासित होने चाहिएं। फिर भी, वर्तमान परिस्थिति को देखते हुए विद्यमान व्यवस्था में तत्काल कोई परिवर्तन नहीं किया जा सकता।

Avro-748 Planes

*579. **Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Avro-748 plane has been declared unfit for use by the Air Force, and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of States in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

Training to Foreign Cadets by I.A.F.

*580. **Shri S. C. Samanta:**
Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:
Shri M. L. Dwivedi:
Shri Subodh Hansda:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Indian Air Force is imparting training to Cadets from foreign countries at present and also sending its Flying Instructors for training Cadets abroad;

(b) if so, the names of countries from where Cadets are undergoing training and the countries to which Indian Instructors were sent; and

(c) the approximate expenditure in terms of Indian currency and foreign exchange incurred thereon by Governments concerned and India?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Cadets from the following countries are undergoing training in Indian Air Force Institutions:

(i) Iraq.

(ii) Nigeria.

(iii) Ghana.

(iv) Yemen.

Indian Instructors have been sent to the U.A.R. and Iraq:

(c) Our Instructors abroad are paid by the countries concerned in their currency. Training of foreign cadets is generally paid for by the countries concerned. The total expenditure incurred in these respects by the different Governments is not known to us. However, an amount of approximately Rs. 3.5 lakhs will be incurred by the Government of India on this account.

Embargo on Supply of Components to India

*581. **Shri B. K. Das:**
Shri Subodh Hansda:
Shri S. C. Samanta:
Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:
Shri M. L. Dwivedi:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the embargo on the supply of components and spares imposed by some countries upset the production of aircraft and electronic equipments at Bangalore factory;

(b) if so, whether any attempt has been made to manufacture them indigenously; and

(c) how far this has improved the production in both the cases and how much foreign exchange has been saved by the indigenous manufacture of all these components?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Continuous efforts are being made to establish indigenous manufacture of such components and parts as far as practicable.

(c) These components and parts are of specialised types. The requirements do not lend themselves to economical indigenous production in all cases. It is too early to assess the improvement in production or the foreign exchange savings as a result of these efforts.

Effect of Devaluation on Defence Expenditure

*582. **Shri Indrajit Gupta:**
Shri Vasudevan Nair:
Shri Surendra Pal Singh:
Shri Sivamurthi Swamy:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Rupee cost of defence purchases from abroad will substantially push up the country's total defence expenditure; and

(b) if so, whether it is proposed to go in for import substitution on a large scale?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) The Defence purchases from abroad constitute only a small portion of the total Defence expenditure. Consequently, the rupee cost of Defence purchases from abroad will only marginally affect the total Defence expenditure.

(b) Import substitution, wherever feasible, is the policy of Government. This is not only because of the foreign exchange element but also in order to make our defence capacity as self-reliant as possible. Constant effort is being made to establish the production of our defence requirements in India, but this is necessarily a long process.

Compensation to Farmers for Damage on Account of Survey Work

*583. **Shri N. R. Laskar:**
Shri Liladhar Kotoki:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government pay compensation to the owners of land whose crops are damaged as a result of survey work conducted jointly by the officials of India and Pakistan; and

(b) if so, whether the expenditure so incurred is met by the Central or State Government?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) and (b). Whenever it is found necessary, compensation is paid to agriculturists by the State Governments for loss of any standing crops due to demarcation work.

A.I.R. Daily Price Bulletin

*584. **Shri Gulshan:**
Shri Narasimha Reddy:
Shri A. K. Gopalan:
Shri Dasaratha Deb:
Shri M. N. Swamy:
Shri Dinen Bhattacharya:

Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state:

(a) whether attention of Government has been drawn to a news-item in the *Hindustan Times* dated the 22nd June, 1966 stating that the A.I.R. daily price bulletin is far off the mark of the actual prices prevailing in the market; and

(b) if so, the reaction of Government thereto?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The price bulletins are broadcast by A.I.R. with a view to keep the public constantly posted with the prevailing prices of essential commodities and to make them conscious of the need to resist any unwarranted increase on the part of individual dealers. In cases where the prices of certain articles are fixed by the manufacturers or by the local authorities concerned, A.I.R. gives due publicity to such prices. In other cases, the lowest prevailing prices are announced to induce the consumers to refuse to pay more. These bulletins are never intended to serve as a catalogue

of prices authorised by the local administration.

Soviet Economic Aid for Pakistan

*585. **Shri D. C. Sharma:** Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Pakistan has sought economic aid from the U.S.S.R.;

(b) if so, the response of the U.S.S.R. Government thereto; and

(c) the reaction of Government thereto?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) and (b). Yes, Sir. The Soviet Union has been giving economic aid to Pakistan.

(c) Government is of the view that such aid does not affect the totality of Soviet-Indian relations.

Prohibition in Indian Armed Forces

*586. **Shri Surendra Pal Singh:** Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Tek Chand Committee on Prohibition has recently submitted another volume of its report on consumption of liquor by members of Armed Forces;

(b) if so, the main observations made in this report; and

(c) Government's reaction thereto?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) The Committee submitted its report in two parts in April, 1964 and August, 1964. Part I of the report contained certain recommendations/observations directly concerning the Defence Organisation. No other report has been submitted by the Committee.

(b) and (c). The following recommendations in Part I of the Report of the Study Team on Prohibition submitted in April 1964 concern the Defence Organisation directly:

(i) a special study may be made on the alcoholic ravages *vis-a-vis* armed forces, particularly on its harmful effects on sight, hearing, sense of smell, accurate thinking, quick decisions, prolonged endurance, steady nerves and on ability to fix attention;

(ii) in no case should Army personnel be permitted to consume alcholic beverages from contraband sources; and

(iii) for the words 'guilty of drunkenness' as used in Section 52 of the Navy Act and 'found in a state of intoxication' as used in the Air Force Act, 1950 and the Army Act (Section 48), the words 'under the influence of drink or drug' should be substituted.

2. These recommendations were examined in consultation with the Chief of Staff, the Director General, Armed Forces Medical Services and the Legal Advisers of the three Services. following conclusions were reached:—

(a) There are no indications to show that the use of alcohol by members of armed forces has been deleterious to the performance of their duties in any way. Effective propaganda and control have led to a considerable reduction in the consumption of alcohol by armed forces personnel.

(b) There is no question of armed forces personnel having been permitted to consume alcoholic beverages from contraband source.

(c) The present rules, regulations and legal statutes are adequate and have operated satisfactorily. As such it is not necessary to make any change in the service Acts.

Schemes in Mysore State

*587. **Shri H. C. Linga Reddy:** Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state:

(a) the amount allotted to Mysore State in the Third Plan period on the various schemes of his Ministry; and

(b) the amount spent on the various schemes with names and estimated costs thereof together with the stage of progress?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) and (b). A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*Placed in Library. See* No. LT-6838/66].

Chief Ministers' Meeting at Delhi

***588. Shri Hem Raj:**
Shri Daljit Singh:
Shri Onkar Lal Berwa:
Shri Prakash Vir Shastri:
Shri Hukam Chand Kachhavaiya:
Shri Raghunath Singh:
Shri Gulshan:

Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any meeting of the Chief Ministers of different States was held recently at Delhi;

(b) if so, the subjects discussed therein and conclusions arrived at; and

(c) how they are going to be implemented?

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): (a) Yes Sir.

(b) and (c). A statement giving the information is laid on the Table of the House. [*Placed in Library. See* No. LT-6839/66].

Arrest of Indian Survey Party by East Pakistan Authorities

***590. Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:**
Shri Madhu Limaye:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a member of the official party in charge of surveying the Eastern border with Pakistan was wrongfully arrested by the Pakistan authorities despite the fact that the said person's papers were in order;

(b) if so, whether any protest has been made and compensation asked for by Government for the harassment of the said officer; and

(c) the response of the Pakistan Government?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c). A protest was lodged with the local Pakistan authorities. The Survey official was released within half-an-hour of the incident.

Mauritius Demand for Independence

***591. Shri Narendra Singh Mahida:** Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Premier of Mauritius has approached our Prime Minister for assistance in their struggle for Independence;

(b) if so, the reply given thereto;

(c) whether it is a fact that Great Britain has proclaimed that the colony of Mauritius shall attain full Independence not later than the 31st December, 1966; and

(d) whether our Prime Minister has expressed any opinion in the matter to the British Prime Minister?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh): (a) and (b). The Prime Minister of Mauritius has kept us informed of constitutional developments leading to independence of his country. We have assured him that Government of India is whole heartedly with the people of Mauritius in this struggle for independence and fully supports majority rule in Mauritius based on the principle of one-man-one-vote. We have also expressed the view that India is opposed to the introduction of any restrictive voting system prejudicial to the interests of the people and that we would continue to press these views in international and Commonwealth formus.

(c) The arrangement agreed at the Constitutional Conference held in London in September 1965, was that the general elections would be held in Mauritius and that if the new Legislative Assembly duly elected under new system passed a resolution in favour of independence, this would be granted subject to a prior six-month period of internal self-government. This process was intended to be completed by 31st December, 1966.

(d) This did not become necessary as the objectionable recommendations of the Banwell Commission Report have already been radically altered to the satisfaction of the Premier of Mauritius and leaders of other political parties.

Radio Kashmir

*592. **Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 386 on the 7th December, 1964 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Announcers at Jammu and Srinagar Radio Stations still mentioned "Radio Kashmir" and not "All India Radio" or "Akashvani" as is being done in all other stations in India; and

(b) if so, when this anomaly will become a thing of the past?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Government do not consider it necessary to change the nomenclature of the radio stations at Srinagar and Jammu for the present. If any change becomes necessary in future, it can be considered.

पाकिस्तान में अल्पसंख्यक वर्ग

*593. **श्री बड़े :**
श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :
श्री सोनावने :
श्री यु० द० सिंह :
श्री बी० चं० शर्मा :

क्या **वैदेशिक-कार्य** मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि पाकिस्तान में अल्पसंख्यक वर्गों पर अत्याचार किये जा रहे हैं ;

(ख) क्या यह भी सच है कि अल्पसंख्यकों की हत्या, लूटमार, अपहरण तथा बलात्कार के मामले दिन प्रतिदिन बढ़ते जा रहे हैं ;

(ग) यदि हां, तो इस मामले में सरकार ने क्या कार्यवाही की है ; और

(घ) वर्ष 1966 में अल्पसंख्यक वर्गों के कितने व्यक्ति भारत आए ?

वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री (श्री स्वर्ण सिंह) : (क) और (ख). पाकिस्तान में अल्पसंख्यकों को परेशान किये जाने की खबरें और असुरक्षा तथा मजबूरी की उनकी भावनाओं के बारे में समय-समय पर हमें मालूम पड़ता रहता है, लेकिन भारत सरकार के पास ऐसा कोई प्रमाण नहीं जिससे यह पता चलता हो कि प्रश्न में जिस तरह के अत्याचारों का उल्लेख किया गया है वैसे अत्याचार किए जा रहे हैं या वे बढ़ते जा रहे हैं ।

(ग) नेहरू-लियाकत समझौते के अधीन, जिसमें कि पाकिस्तान सरकार ने अल्पसंख्यकों के प्रति अपने दायित्वों की पुष्टि की है, परेशान किए जाने के एक-एक मामले को पाकिस्तान सरकार के साथ उठाया जाता है । जब कभी आवश्यकता हुई है, इन दायित्वों को पूरा करने की उनकी जिम्मेदारी की ओर भी पाकिस्तान सरकार का ध्यान दिलाया गया है ।

(घ) 1 जनवरी से 23 जुलाई, 1966 तक अल्पसंख्यक समुदाय के कितने लोग

पूर्व पाकिस्तान से भारत आए उनकी संख्या 4523 है। इसी अवधि में ऐसे 95 व्यक्ति पश्चिम पाकिस्तान से भारत आए।

Chinese Broadcasts regarding Tibetan Refugees

*594. **Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:**
Shri Hem Barua:
Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:
Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia:
Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:
Shri S. M. Banerjee:
Shri Kashi Ram Gupta:
Shri Madhu Limaye:
Shri Kishen Pattnayak:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that regular broadcasts are being made from the Chinese Radio at Lhasa (Tibet) giving distorted pictures about the conditions of Tibetan refugees in India;

(b) the steps taken to counteract such propaganda; and

(c) whether any request has been made to Government by the Dalai Lama to permit him to make periodical broadcasts from All-India Radio to rebut such propaganda and whether such permission has been given?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Tibetan language broadcasts of the All India Radio have been giving information about our rehabilitation programmes for the Tibetan refugees and the progress achieved in the implementation of these programmes. Information about the care being given to the problems of this community, uprooted from its homeland, and the sympathy and friendship with which Tibetan refugees are treated in India is also disseminated through these broadcasts.

(c) Government has not received any specific request in this regard, but the Dalai Lama's speeches are relayed on the All India Radio's Tibetan programmes on suitable occasions.

Pak. Protest to U.N.O. about Alleged Indian Plan for Exploding Atom Bomb

*595. **Shri Swell:**
Shri M. Rampure:

Wille the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Pakistan has protested to the U.N.O. against alleged India's plan to explode an atomic bomb in the near future; and

(b) if so, Government's reaction thereto?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Government have received information that Pakistan sent a note to the United Nationas Secretary-General falsely alleging that India is planning to carry out a test explosion of a nuclear device in the near future.

(b) Government have reiterated their policy to use nuclear energy exclusively for peaceful purposes and have informed the U.N. authorities and all concerned Governments that the allegations reported to be contained in the note of the Pakistan Government are baseless.

Approach by U.S. Embassy for Exemption from Payment of Electricity Dues

*596. **Shri Dinen Bhattacharya:**
Shri A. K. Gopalan:
Shri Umanath:
Shri Biren Dutta:
Shri Dasaratha Deb:
Dr. Saradish Roy:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the New Delhi Municipal Committee has been approached by the U.S. Embassy in Delhi to exempt them from the payment of dues in respect of electricity consumption; and

(b) if so, the reaction of Government thereto?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh): (a) and (b). The Delhi Municipal Corporation, in 1962, increased the rate of electricity charges by one NP per unit with restrospective effect from 1st July, 1959 and asked the New Delhi Municipal Committee to pay the dues by recovery from the consumers. All the foreign Missions in Delhi, including the U.S. Embassy, were affected by this increase. While the Foreign Missions are prepared to pay the increased charges in respect of their official premises, difficulties have arisen in respect of residences of individual officers who have left India on completion of their duty and some of whom have retired from service or died. The matter is under discussion.

Purchase by Pakistan of F-86 Sabre Jets

*597. **Shri P. C. Borooah:**
Shri Hem Barua:
Shri Swell:
Shri Hem Raj:
Shri M. Rampure:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the reported purchase by Pakistan of the 50 American-designed F-86 Sabre Jets, despite the embargo placed by the U.S.A. on the supply of arms to India and Pakistan; and

(b) if so, whether Government have asked the U.S.A. Government how this violation of the embargo has been caused and their reply in this behalf?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Government have learnt that Pakistan has received through Iran a number of F-86 aircraft which West Germany had sold to Iran for Iranian use. The West German Government had bought these aircraft some years ago from Canada where these aircraft were being manufactured under a U.S. licence.

(b) The United States Government is not involved in the sale of these aircraft which have reached Pakistan. The issue of the return of these aircraft to Iran is being pursued with the Governments concerned in accordance with their assurances to us that these aircraft would not be diverted to a third country.

पूर्वी-पाकिस्तान सरकार द्वारा श्री त्रैलोक्य नाथ चक्रवर्ती की नजरबन्दी

*598. **श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय**
डा० लक्ष्मीमल्ल सिंघवी :
श्री काशीराम गुप्त :
श्री वड़े :

क्या वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि स्वतंत्रता संग्राम के सेनानी, श्री त्रैलोक्य नाथ चक्रवर्ती जो बंगाल में "महाराज" के नाम से प्रसिद्ध है, इस समय पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में मैमनसिंह जेल में नजरबन्द हैं ;

(ख) क्या यह भी सच है कि इस समय उनकी स्थिति बड़ी चिंताजनक है; और

(ग) यदि हां, तो सरकार ने उनको रिहा कराने के लिए अब तक क्या कार्यवाही की है ?

वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री (श्री स्वर्ण सिंह) : (क) जी हां।

(ख) सुलभ सूचना के अनुसार श्री त्रैलोक्य नाथ चक्रवर्ती बीमार हैं।

(ग) चूंकि जाहिरा तौर पर श्री चक्रवर्ती राजनीतिक कारणों से हिरासत में रखे जा रहे हैं, इसलिए भारत सरकार ने पाकिस्तान सरकार से लिखा-पढ़ी नहीं की है, लेकिन

उन्हें आशा है कि पाकिस्तान सरकार अपने अल्पसंख्यक समुदाय के लोगों के प्रति अपने दायित्व और सामान्य मानवीय दायित्वों का भी ध्यान रखेगी ।

Restoration of Tele-Communications with Pakistan

2844. **Shri Madhu Limaye:**
Shri Kishen Pattnayak:
Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to refer to the reply given to the Calling Attention Notice on the 3rd May, 1966 and state:

(a) whether Government have since made new efforts to restore tele-communications with Pakistan;

(b) whether Pakistan has agreed to replace the obsolete equipment to improve circuit performance;

(c) whether Pakistan has agreed to "joint tests" suggested by India to enable quick repairs in the East Pakistan; and

(d) if the reply to parts (b) and (c) above be in the negative whether this failure on the part of Pakistan to implement the clause VI of Tashkent Declaration has been brought to the notice of U.S.S.R. and U.S.A.?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) It has been intimated by the concerned authorities in Pakistan that no definite decision has so far been taken by their Government on the subject.

(c) Not yet.

(d) Friendly Governments are kept informed of the developments relating to the Tashkent Declaration including the negative attitude adopted by Pakistan towards implementing its various provisions.

Expenditure on Visits of Foreign Dignitaries

2845. **Shrimati Ramdulari Sinha:** Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state the amount spent on receptions or otherwise, in connection with Heads of States, Vice-Presidents and Heads of Government of foreign countries who visited India during 1965-66?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): A sum of Rs. 3,94,033.00 was spent on receptions etc. in connection with the visits of Heads of States, Vice-Presidents and Heads of Government of foreign countries during the year 1965-66.

Land for Ex-Servicemen in Kerala

2846. **Shri M. K. Kumaran:** Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) the area of land earmarked for allotment to ex-servicemen and service personnel in Kerala;

(b) the area already allotted; and

(c) when it will be available to them?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) The Kerala Land Assignment Rules, 1964, lay down that 25 per cent of the land available for assignment in each village shall be reserved for assignment to serving military personnel and dependants of those who are killed or disabled in active service on receipt of applications from them. The military personnel may apply for land anywhere in the State irrespective of the State to which they belong but in the matter of assignment of land preference will be given to persons belonging to Kerala.

(b) and (c). The information is being collected from the State Government and will be laid on the Table of the House when received.

Levy of Surcharge on Imported Newsprint

2847. Shrimati Maimoona Sultan:
Shri Ram Harkh Yadav:

Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Indian Eastern Newspapers society has decided to levy a surcharge of 10 per cent on the advertisement rates from the 1st July, 1966 as a result of the increased cost of imported newsprint and devaluation of rupee in the country; and

(b) if so, the reaction of Government thereto?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) Yes, Sir, from 1st August, 1966.

(b) Government have also agreed to pay the surcharge on advertisements released by them.

I.A.F. Jet Crash near Hyderabad

2848. Shri Ram Harkh Yadav:
Shri M. R. Krishna:
Shri Bade:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether an I.A.F. Vampire Jet crashed at Bavanapally near Hyderabad on the 30th June, 1966;

(b) if so, the details of the accident; and

(c) the loss of life and property as a result thereof?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) The accident occurred near Mudfort, Secunderabad.

(b) Flight Cadet K. Tarfa of Nigerian Air Force was on a solo Training flight. Radio contact with the aircraft was lost when it was at 18,000' over Hakimpet airfield, heading in an easterly direction. Subsequently, the pilot abandoned the aircraft and landed with the help of a parachute in a seriously injured state. He succumbed to his injuries in the Military Hospital. The aircraft crashed in an inhabited area. A court of Inquiry has been ordered to investigate the accident. Full details of the accident will be known when the report of the Court of Inquiry is received.

(c) The Pilot, Flight Cadet K. Tarfa, was killed as a result of the accident. In addition, seven civilians suffered minor injuries. The aircraft was damaged beyond economical repairs. Civilian property (3 houses, one church building and some personal belongings) was also damaged.

Broadcasting Station at Mangalore

2849. Shri M. K. Kumaran:
Shri H. C. Linga Reddy:

Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government propose to set up a Broadcasting Station at Mangalore; and

(b) if so, when the proposal is likely to be materialised?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) and (b). The Fourth Five Year Plan for development of broadcasting provides for a Station at Mangalore. The Plan has yet to be approved. At this stage it is not possible to say when the proposal is likely to materialise.

Film entitled "Dr. Zhivago"

2850. Shri M. K. Kumaran: Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Film Censors Board have given clearance for the release of the film 'Dr. Zhivago';

(b) if so, the reasons for the inordinate delay in giving clearance; and

(c) if not, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) The Central Board of Film Censors have decided to certify the film

for public exhibition and a certificate will be issued after necessary formalities have been completed.

(b) and (c). The film was initially examined by an Examining Committee and later by the Revising Committee, who *inter alia* recommended that the film might be referred to the Central Government. On receipt of a reference from the Chairman of the Board under the proviso to sub-rule 12 of rule 25 of the Cinematograph (Censorship) Rules 1958, the film was previewed and suitable directions have been given to the Board in regard to the certification of the film.

International Film Festival, Berlin

2851. **Shri Ram Harkh Yadav:** Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Indian Films participated in the International Film Festival held recently at Berlin; and

(b) if so, their achievements?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) Yes, Sir. India participated in the International Film Festival held at Berlin in June-July 1966 by the entry of the feature film 'Nayak' and the documentary film "That Delta That River" both in the Competitive Section, and the Documentary 'Dances of Assam' in the Information Section. In the Trade Fair, the feature film 'Arzoo' was shown.

(b) A special award of honour was created for the first time for Shri Satyajit Ray, Director of the film 'Nayak' 'in recognition of his high artistic eminence in the world of film'. The award was made not only for the important human value of the film 'Nayak' but for the entire body of Shri Ray's creative achievement. The film 'Nayak' also received the "International Prize of Critics" Award. The business results of the film 'Arzoo' are reported to be very encouraging.

Exchange of P.O.Ws.

2852. **Shri Lakhmu Bhawani:** Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether all the Prisoners of War of India and Pakistan have been exchanged or some of them are yet to be exchanged; and

(b) if so, their number?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) Yes, Sir. All the Prisoners of War have been exchanged.

(b) Does not arise.

Asylum sought by a Tibetan in Sikkim

2853. **Shri Ram Sewak Yadav:**
Shri Madhu Limaye:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a Tibetan had recently sought asylum in Sikkim;

(b) whether asylum was refused by the Sikkim authorities;

(c) whether any pressure was brought to bear by the Chinese; and

(d) Government's reaction thereto?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Not only one but 26 persons, who entered Sikkim from Tibet, sought asylum during the last three months.

(b) and (c). No, Sir. The Government of India are responsible for the defence and external relations of Sikkim. No pressure was brought to bear by the Chinese.

(d) Does not arise.

Anti-Indian Propaganda by British and American News Agencies and T.V. System

2854. **Shri M. K. Kumaran:** Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the attention of Government has been drawn to the anti-

Indian propaganda in Asian and African countries carried on by the British and American news agencies and T.V. system; and

(b) if so, whether any steps have been taken to counteract it?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) The Government are aware of the misrepresentation of India caused by the circulation of partial and incorrect news by some news agencies and television systems operating in Asian and African countries.

(b) Our Missions in the countries concerned take every opportunity to correct such news by issuing bulletins and pamphlets, by briefing journalists, by inviting them to visit India and by adopting whatever other methods they can within their means and resources.

Condition of Indians in South Africa

2855. Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya:
Shri Narendra Singh Mahida:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether his attention has been drawn to a statement of A. N. Lawrance, former Minister of South Africa stating that the condition of Indians there was worse than that of coloured races of mixed descent; and

(b) the steps taken to improve the status of Indians there?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) In the U.N. General Assembly and elsewhere India has consistently taken up the question of South Africa's racial policies and their detrimental effect on people of Indian origin and others affected by the pernicious application of apartheid. From the 3rd Session onwards, the General Assembly has repeatedly asked the Government of South Africa to enter into discussion, on the subject, at a round table conference, with India and Pakistan, taking into consideration the purposes and principles of the Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights. The Government of South Africa has continued to ignore these appeals and from the 10th session onwards, has not listening, you were not attentive, this item. From the 17th session (1962), the question of treatment of Indians has been merged with the wider question of apartheid since the lives of all the non-white people in that country are equally affected by these racial policies. We are continuing the struggle against apartheid in South Africa along with other like-minded nations, at the U.N. and at various other international forums.

As India has no diplomatic relations with South Africa, the Government of India is not in a position to make any direct approach to the Government of the Union of South Africa in this regard.

U.N. General Assembly Session

2856. Shri Ram Harkh Yadav: Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be place in the near future; and

(a) the time when the Session of the U.N. General Assembly will take pleased to state:

(b) the details of the members of the Indians Delegation attending the Session?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) The XXI Session of U.N. General Assembly is scheduled to commence on the 20th September, 1966.

(b) The composition of the Indian delegation has not yet been finalised.

Marine Diesel Engine Factory

2858. Shri A. V. Raghavan: Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 3203 on the 4th April, 1966 and state:

(a) whether any final decision has since been taken in the matter of

locating the marine diesel engine factory; and

(b) if so, where the same will be located?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) and (b). The recommendation regarding Ranchi as the location is under consideration. The factory will be part of the Garden Reach Workshops.

Conference of Station Directors of A. I. R.

2859. Shri Ram Harkh Yadav: Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state:

(a) whether a conference of Station Directors of All India Radio was recently held in Delhi;

(b) if so, the recommendations made for improving the tone of the All India Radio programmes; and

(c) the Government's reactions thereto?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*Placed in Library. See* No. LT-6840/66].

(c) All the recommendations are designed to improve the output and quality of A.I.R. programmes and their impact on the people. Government have not examined them in detail but they are un-exceptionable.

Indian News Review

2860. Shri Sezhiyan: Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state the events and other important items included in the Indian News Reviews released every week from the 10th June, 1966 till date, week-wise?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): The information is given in the memo of contents of Indian News Reviews No. 922—931 laid on the Table of the House. [*Placed in Library. See* No. LT-6841/66].

Rehabilitation of Ex-Servicemen in Kerala

2861. Shri A. K. Gopalan:
Shri Umanath:
Shri A. V. Raghavan:
Shri Pottekkatt:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is any proposal before the Kerala Service Fund Committee for rehabilitation of ex-servicemen to set up a land colony at Taliparamba in Cannannore District of Kerala;

(b) if so, the progress made in this regard; and

(c) the extent of lands proposed to be acquired and the amount set apart for the colonisation scheme?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) to (c). Information has been called for from the Secretary, State Soldiers', Sailors' and Airmen's Board, Kerala, and will be laid on the Table of the House, when received.

Accident to Air Craft carrying Prime Minister

2862. Shrimati Savitri Nigam:
Shri Hukam Chand Kachhavaiya:
Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:
Shri Sonavane:
Shri Raghunath Singh:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) the causes of accident to the plane on which the Prime Minister was flying from Poona to Delhi on the 26th May, 1966; and

(b) whether any persons sustained injuries and extent of loss suffered, if any?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) and (b). The incident occurred

on 25-5-1966. At about 1700 hours while the aircraft was at a distance of about 25 miles from Palam over Pataudi, and was at a height of about 6,000 feet above ground level in the process of descending, a bird was seen at about 100 yards from the aircraft. The visibility in the air at the time of the incident was very poor. The Captain of the aircraft manoeuvred the aircraft to avoid the bird, thereby losing about 20 feet or so in height. As a result, some of the passengers were thrown upwards. Two of them received minor injuries. Prior to the incident, the flight had been bumpy and the Captain had displayed the sign for fastening seat belts. Passengers who had followed this instruction suffered no injury. A first-aid kit was available in the aircraft and first-aid was rendered to the injured passengers. No loss was suffered.

भूटान में टेलीफोन

2863. **श्री विभूति मिश्र :**
श्री क० ना० तिवारी :

क्या रक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि भूटान सरकार के अनुरोध पर सरकार का विचार भूटान में विभिन्न शहरों के बीच टेलीफ़ोन सम्पर्क स्थापित करने का है; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो इस काम पर कितना व्यय होगा ?

प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री (श्री यशवन्तराव चह्वाण): (क) जी हां ।

(ख) भूटान में अब तक स्वीकृत की गई योजनाओं पर होने वाला खर्च लगभग 130 लाख रुपये होगा ।

स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री का स्मारक

2864. **श्री सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद :**
श्री रिशांग किशिंग :
श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री :
श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :
श्री जगदेव सिंह सिद्धान्ती :
श्री रघुनाथ सिंह :
श्रीमती रामदुलारी सिन्हा :
श्री लक्ष्म भवानी :

क्या प्रधान मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि ।

(क) स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री की गरिमा के अनुसार उनका स्मारक बनाने के लिए सरकार ने क्या कार्यवाही की है ;

(ख) क्या सरकार ने सम्पूर्ण देश में 'विजय भवन' बनाने के प्रश्न पर विचार कर लिया है; और

(ग) क्या ऐसा कोई केन्द्रीय विजय-स्मारक बनाया जायेगा जिसमें आरम्भ से लेकर ताशकन्द घोषणा तक विजय की भावना का चित्रण हो ?

प्रधान मंत्री तथा अणु शक्ति मंत्री (श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी) : (क) राष्ट्रपति की अध्यक्षता में जीवन के विभिन्न क्षेत्रों का प्रतिनिधित्व करने वाले प्रायः एक सौ सदस्यों की एक राष्ट्रीय समिति गठित की गई है जो स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री, श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री की स्मृति को चिरस्थायी बनाने तथा लाल बहादुर शास्त्री राष्ट्रीय स्मारक ट्रस्ट (न्यास) के लिए आवश्यक साधन भी जुटाने की योजनाएं बनायेगी । इस दिशा में कुछ प्रारम्भिक कार्यवाहियों के विधायन के लिए उप-राष्ट्रपति की अध्यक्षता में एक कर्णधार समिति कार्य कर रही है ।

इसके अतिरिक्त जहां स्वर्गीय प्रधान मंत्री श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री का दाह-संस्कार किया गया था उस क्षेत्र के विकास के लिए रेखांकन तथा अन्य योजनाओं के पर्यवेक्षण के निमित्त उप-राष्ट्रपति की अध्यक्षता में एक समिति कार्य कर रही है।

(ख) और (ग). इस प्रकार के प्रस्ताव सरकार के विचाराधीन नहीं हैं।

भारतीय चलचित्र

2865. **श्री सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद :**
श्री रिशांग किशिंग :

क्या सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या सरकार को पता है कि भारतीय चलचित्रों का स्तर दिन प्रति दिन गिरता ही जा रहा है और घिसी-पिटी फिल्में ही बनती जा रही हैं ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो इसके क्या कारण है ; और

(ग) ऐसे चलचित्रों के निर्माण पर, जिनकी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय बाजार में कोई मांग नहीं है, विदेशी मुद्रा खर्च करने के क्या कारण हैं ?

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री (श्री राज बहादुर) : (क) और (ख). फिल्म एक कला कृति होने के साथ साथ संस्कृति और मनोरंजन का भी माध्यम है और इन दृष्टियों से इसका मूल्यांकन भी भिन्न होगा। एक सी कसौटी न होने के कारण भिन्न भिन्न समय पर विभिन्न व्यक्तियों द्वारा निर्मित, विभिन्न भाषाओं की फिल्मों की तुलना करना सम्भव नहीं। फिर भी, यह सभी मानते हैं कि भारतीय फिल्मों ने टेकनीकी दृष्टि से ऊंचा स्थान हासिल कर लिया है। फिल्म निर्माण में लगे लोगों की योग्यता और दृष्टिकोणों में विभिन्नता होने और फिल्म उद्योग को अपनी विशिष्ट परिस्थितियों के कारण कला की दृष्टि से फिल्में एक जैसी नहीं होती।

(ग) भारतीय फिल्में अधिकतर भारत में दिखाने के लिए बनाई जाती हैं, यद्यपि बहुत सी विदेशों में दिखाने के लिए भी होती हैं। 1965-66 में 163.94 लाख रुपए के मूल्य की तैयार सिनेमा फिल्में निर्यात की गई, जबकि आयात की गई कच्ची फिल्मों का मूल्य 252.11 लाख रुपए था।

Situation in South Africa

2866. **Shri Sidheshwar Prasad:** Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether his attention has been drawn to a B.B.C. television interview by the U.N. Secretary-General saying that most U.N. Members believed that the situation in South Africa was a threat to International peace and that the next step to secure a change in South Africa's apartheid policy was economic sanctions;

(b) if so, what steps, if any, have been taken by the U.N.O. after the announcement of its Chief Executive; and

(c) when South Africa is likely to scrap its 'apartheid policy'?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir. Government have seen a transcript of this interview.

(b) No particular action has been taken by any organ of the United Nations since the television interview given by the UN Secretary-General. However, steps are continuing to be made to enlarge the composition of the **Special Committee on the Policies** of Apartheid of the Government of South-Africa with a view to increase its effectiveness by making its membership more broadbased and more particularly by securing the cooperation of the Great Powers.

(c) It is difficult to state as to when

South Africa would abandon its 'apartheid' policy. As pointed out by the U.N. Secretary-General, this would to a large extent depend on some general consensus among the big Powers regarding the methods to be adopted.

पादरी माइकेल स्कॉट का वक्तव्य

2867. **श्री सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद :**
श्री यशपाल सिंह :
श्री प्र० चं० बरुआ :
श्री स० मो० बनर्जी :
श्री दी० चं० शर्मा :
डा० लक्ष्मीमल्ल सिंघवी :
श्री च० का० भट्टाचार्य :
श्री दे० द० पुरी :

क्या **वैदेशिक-कार्य** मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि भारत से निष्कासन के बाद पादरी माइकेल स्कॉट ने इंग्लैंड में कई भारत विरोधी वक्तव्य दिये थे ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो उसका ब्यौरा क्या है ; और

(ग) उस पर सरकार की क्या प्रतिक्रिया है ?

वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री (श्री स्वर्ण सिंह) : (क) और (ख). 30 मई के 'टाइम्स लंदन' में प्रकाशित एक बयान में रेवरेन्ड माइकेल स्कॉट ने कहा कि मध्यस्थता के बिना नागा समस्या का कोई समाधान नहीं हो सकता और उन्होंने नागालैंड में भारतीय सुरक्षा सैनिकों द्वारा किए गए कथित अत्याचार को तूल भी दिया। 19जुलाई को लंदन में आयोजित एक प्रेस सम्मेलन में, रेवरेन्ड माइकेल स्कॉट ने सब के पास एक-एक पैम्फ्लेट भेजा जिसमें उनके अकसर व्यक्त किए गए विचार सम्मिलित हैं—जैसे, प्रभुसत्ता का प्रश्न, मध्यस्थता और ऐतिहासिक पृष्ठभूमि तथा कथित अत्याचार की जांच के लिए आयोग ।

(ग) लंदन-स्थित भारतीय हाई कमिश्नर ने पहली जून के 'टाइम्स आफ लंदन' में प्रकाशित एक बयान में रेवरेन्ड माइकेल स्कॉट के आरोपों का विरोध किया । उनके प्रेस सम्मेलन का कोई प्रतिकूल प्रभाव नहीं पड़ा । प्रोफसर जे० एच० हटन ने, जो सम्मेलन में उपस्थित थे और जो नागाओं को जानते हैं, रेवरेन्ड स्कॉट की दलीलों का विरोध किया और कहा कि "छिपे नागाओं को ऐसा राज्यपद (स्टेटहुड) स्वीकार करना चाहिये जिसे भारत के किसी अन्य राज्य की अपेक्षा अधिक आंतरिक स्वायत्तता (आटोनामी) प्राप्त हो"। हम इस प्रतिकूल प्रचार का विरोध करने के लिए आवश्यक कदम उठा रहे हैं ।

Trust for Film Artistes

2868. Shri Yashpal Singh: Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have any proposal under consideration for creating a Trust which would help develop the Industry as well as provide some annuity to the artistes when they retire from the screen; and

(b) if so, when it will be finalised?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) and (b). Proposals have been submitted in general terms by the film Industry for cerating a Trust which will provide some annuity to artistes when the retire from the profession and for making available funds for the development of the film industry. These are being examined.

Conscription for Army Engineering and Medical Corps

2869. *Shri Yashpal Singh:
Shri M. K. Kumaran:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the proposal for compulsory conscription for Army Engineering and Medical Corps has been finalised; and

(b) if so, the broad details thereof?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) and (b). Under the Compulsory Service Liability Scheme, civilian engineer officers serving with the Central/State Governments and Public Sector Undertakings, under revised recruitment rules, are liable to serve in the Defence Services or on work relating to defence effort anywhere in India or abroad, if so required, for a minimum period of 4 years, including the period of training, during the first 10 years' of their service. The scheme is in operation in the Army, where Short Service Commissions are granted to such engineer officers, since July, 1965. A similar scheme has been introduced for civilian medical officers also and if necessary, commissions will be given to such officers, recruited under revised rules, as and when they become available.

Samachar Bharati

2870. Shri Yashpal Singh:
Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:
Shri M. L. Dwivedi:
Shri S. C. Samanta:
Shri Subodh Hansda:

Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the All-India Rashtrabhasha Sammelan have recently requested Government to set up a "Samachar Bharati", a news agency using Devanagri of other Indian script, for the distribution of news in the country; and

(b) if so, reaction of Government thereon?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) and (b). No formal request has been received by the Government from the 12th All-India Rashtrabhasha Sammelan to set up 'Samachar Bharati, a news agency using Devnagari or other Indian language script for the distribution of news in the country. The Government have, however, seen press reports regarding the recommendation of the Sammelan in this regard. The Press Commission had recommended that news agencies should not be State-owned or State-controlled. The Government accepted the recommendation and see no reason to change the previous decision. It may, however, be pointed out that a new news agency called "Samachar Bharati" has been set up which will undertake distribution of news in Hindi and other Indian languages to Indian languages newspapers. The Government have decided to grant this news agency a loan of Rs. 5 lakhs. The terms and conditions of the loan are under consideration of the Government. Two correspondents of the news agency have also been temporarily accredited to the Government of India.

Flag Day, 1965

2871. Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey: Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 453 on the 21st February, 1966 and state:

(a) the total amount collected during the Flag Day in 1965; and

(b) the amount collected as compared to that of the last year?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) Rs. 23,25,067·78.

(b) The previous year's collection was Rs. 25,01,907·91.

परमाणु प्रयोगशालाओं में अनुसन्धान कार्य

2872. श्रीमती सावित्री निगम : क्या **प्रधान मंत्री** यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि 1965–66 में कृषि और जीव विज्ञान के सम्बन्ध में परमाणु प्रयोगशालाओं में किये गये अनुसन्धानों के परिणोमों का प्रचार करने के लिए क्या कार्यवाही की गई है ?

प्रधान मंत्री तथा अणु शक्ति मंत्री (श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी): आयनीकारी विकिरण के जीवात्मक प्रभावों का अध्ययन करने तथा व्यावसायिक महत्व के पौधों जैसे चावल, मूंगफली इत्यादि में उत्परिवर्तन उत्पन्न करने

के लिए परमाणु ऊर्जा संस्थान ट्राम्बे में पर्याप्त कार्य किया गया है । प्रारम्भिक अवस्था में आवश्यकता इस बात की होती है कि ज्यादा फसल देने वाली ये किस्में उन इलाकों में बो कर देखी जायें कहां इनकी बुआई ज्यादा की जाती है ।

केवल में Ptb-10 किस्म का चावल लोकप्रिय है तथा इस किस्म के उत्परिवर्तित बीजों को राज्य के तीन क्षेत्रों में बो कर देखा गया है । अब वेल्ल यानी स्थित कृषि कालेज द्वारा बड़े पैमाने पर परीक्षण किये जाने की योजना बनाई गई है ।

Geb-24 उत्परिवर्ती (TR-1) किस्म को चावल पैदा करने वाले कई क्षेत्रों में बोया गया है । महाराष्ट्र राज्य में इस प्रभेद का परीक्षण करने के लिये एक विस्तृत कार्यक्रम शुरु किया गया है । इस के अतिरिक्त आल इण्डिया राइस प्राजैक्ट कोआडिनेटर, हैदराबाद, को भी विभिन्न भागों में परीक्षण करने के लिए बीज दिये गये ।

ट्राम्बे तथा महाराष्ट्र राज्य के अन्य स्थानों में Kolomba-24 उत्परिवर्ती का लगातार परीक्षण किया जा रहा है ।

जबकि ट्राम्बे में उपज सम्बन्धी परीक्षण किये जा रहे हैं, बड़े बीजों वाली उत्परिवर्ती मूंगफली की उत्पादन क्षमता का एक साथ पता लगाने के लिए इसके बीच तेल देने वाले बीजों के विशेषज्ञों, महाराष्ट्र, मद्रास तथा अन्य राज्यों को दिए गये ।

उत्परिवर्ती बीजों की बढ़ती हुई मांग को पूरा करने तथा संशोधित बीजों को अधिक मात्रा में पैदा करने के लिए ट्राम्बे के समीप मानखुर्द स्थित फार्म के क्षेत्रफल में चोर एकड़ वृद्धि की गई है ।

Plan Publicity

2873. Shrimati Savitri Nigam: Will the Minister of Information and Broadcasting be pleased to state:

(a) the steps taken by Government to present and interpret the policies and the activities of Government through the medium of Press; and

(b) whether some exhibitions are being organised for the plan publicity?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) Information on policies and activities of the Government is released by the Press Information Bureau to the Press through standard categories of Press releases like the Press Communiques, Press Notes, handouts, background material, reference services, feature articles, etc. These services are supported, wherever necessary, by photographs and enonoid blocks. The Indian languages Press (in Hindi and eleven other languages) is served by language units of the Headquarters and 19 Regional/Branch offices of the Press Information Bureau. A teleprinter service links up the Bureau's headquarters at New Delhi with all the Regional/Branch offices located throughout India. Briefing of Press correspondents, holding of Press Conferences and conducting of Press Parties to development projects, etc, are the other means by which liaison is kept between the Government and the Press. Further, accredited pressmen have the facility of obtaining from Information Officers attached to various departments background information and answers to their queries regarding the activities of Government.

(b) Yes, Sir.

इण्डियन रेयर अर्थ्स लिमिटेड

2874. **श्रीमती सावित्री निगम** : क्या प्रधान मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) गत दो वर्षों में इण्डियन रेयर अर्थ्स लिमिटेड ने क्या क्या कार्य किये हैं ;

(ख) इस पर कितना धन व्यय किया गया है ; और

(ग) क्या रेडियो-धर्मी वायु और वातावरण को शुद्ध करने के लिये कोई नये तरीके निकाले जा रहे हैं ?

प्रधान मंत्री तथा अणु शक्ति मंत्री (श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी) : (क) इण्डियन रेयर अर्थ्स लिमिटेड की स्थापना का उद्देश्य देश में परमाणु ऊर्जा कार्यक्रम के लिये महत्वपूर्ण खनिजों को निकालना, अलग करना तथा उनका अभिसंस्करण करना है ।

पिछले दो वर्षों में संयंत्रों का उत्पादन, विक्रय तथा निर्यात-कमाई निम्नलिखित है :—

	उत्पादन	विक्रय	विदेशी मुद्रा कमाई
1964–65	146.4 लाख रुपये	126.08 लाख रुपये	53.5 लाख रुपये
1965–66	177.88 ,,	148.95 ,,	60.77 ,,

सन् 1964–65 और 1965–66 के दौरान कम्पनी को क्रमानुसार 9.19 लाख रुपये और 5.63 लाख रुपये का लाभ हुआ तथा प्रत्येक वर्ष 7 लाख रुपये का लाभांश घोषित किया गया ।

(ख) कम्पनी की पदत्त पूंजी एक करोड़ रुपये है । कम्पनी ने हाल ही में सरकार से 50 लाख रुपये का ऋण लिया है ।

(ग) जी नहीं । कम्पनी के क्रियाकलाप तटीय रेत में विद्यमान खनिजों को अलग करने और मोनाजइट के प्रक्रम से रेयर अर्थ्स क्लोराइड बनाने तथा संश्रित रसायन तैयार करने तक ही सीमित हैं । फिर भी इनको उठाते धरते समय स्वास्थ्य-संकट से बचाने के लिए कम्पनी द्वारा पूरी एहतियाती कार्यवाही की जाती है ।

Action against Student Demonstrators against President of Israel

2875. Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:
Shri Hem Barua:
Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:
Shri Nath Pai:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 5681 on the 16th May, 1966 regarding reported discourtesy to President of Israel and state the reasons for withdrawing the prosecution against the students?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): Prosecution against the Arab students who had demonstrated during the transit halt of the Israeli President in Calcutta was withdrawn as the case against the students could not be sustained in a court of law.

India Weekly

2876. Shri Madhu Limaye:
Shri Kishen Pattnayak:
Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Indian High Commission in London is publishing a weekly called India Weekly;

(b) if so, the amount being spent on this publication by the High Commission;

(c) if the reply to part (a) above is in the negative, whether the Commission is giving any subsidy to this weekly; and

(d) if so, the amount involved?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) No, Sir.

(d) Does not arise.

Anti-Indian Propaganda by China

2877. **Shri Madhu Limaye:**
Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia:
Shri P. C. Borooah:

Wil lthe Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the anti-Indian propaganda that is being carried on by the People's Republic of China; and

(b) if so, the steps taken or proposed to be taken to counter this?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Yes Sir.

(b) Indian Missions abroad and the Ministry of External Affairs in New Delhi keep a close watch on Chinese propaganda against India and every opportunity is taken by them to counter it. The Indian point of view is publicised in various countries through news bulletins, pamphlets, brochures, films and personal contacts. Furthermore, the Heads of our Missions personally explain our point of view to the Foreign Offices in the countries of their accreditation. Indian goodwill missions have visited several countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America to explain India's point of view.

Farm Forum Knowledge

2878. **Shri H. C. Linga Reddy:**
Shri P. R. Chakraverti:

Will the Minister of Information **and Broadcasting** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 811 on the 28th March, 1966 and state:

(a) the further progress made with required for the production of Trans-knowledge amongst the kisans;

(b) the extent to which cheap radios are converted into an easy medium of farm forum knowledge.

(c) whether radios are sought to be manufactured at cheap rates with this end in view; and

(d) if so, the extent to which the steps initiated in this regard have been successful?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) In order to give active support to the intensive agricultural programme of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture and the State Departments of Agriculture and to maintain an effective liaison with them, special units known as Farm and Home units have been set up at the Directorate General, All India Radio and at each of the under-mentioned ten All India Radio stations:

1. Lucknow
2. Patna
3. Vijayawada
4. Poona
5. Tiruchirapalli
6. Delhi
7. Jullundur
8. Sambalpur
9. Raipur
10. Trichur

The main objective of these units is to feed a homogeneous agricultural areas with problem oriented broadcasts and other technical information of use to the farmers.

In planning these programmes, adequate emphasis is laid on field recordings which consist of interviews with farmers, field workers etc. The progressive farmers are also brought to the studios to participate in group discussions.

(b) In addition to the community receivers being supplied to the States under the subsidy scheme, it is proposed to supply low cost sets to areas around the 10 Farm and Home Broadcasting Units mentioned in (a) above. It is expected that these low cost receivers would be availe for small listening groups of farmers not

only to inform them about new techniques but motivate them to adopt new practices.

(c) Yes, Sir.

(d) (i) The specifications for low cost receivers have been finalised.

(ii) A proto-type of the receiver had been made by the Research Department of All India Radio.

(iii) The Federation of Associations of Small Scale Industries have offered to manufacture such low cost receivers.

Pak-China Collusion

2879. Shri K. N. Tiwary:
Shri Bibhuti Mishra:
Shri Krishnapal Singh:
Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri:
Shri P. C. Borooah:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that China in collusion with Pakistan contemplates to attack India in the coming months of September and October either as regular attack or in the form of guerilla warfare as per reports emanating from U.K.; and

(b) if so, Government's authentic information so far received in the matter?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) and (b). It is difficult to say whether any particular country acting alone or in collusion with another, is going to make an attack at a particular time. But the Chinese posture in Tibet is hostile and this does pose a military threat to India irrespective of whether China acts alone or in conjunction with Pakistan.

पादरी माइकल स्कॉट

2880. **श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :**
श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :
श्री रघुनाथ सिंह :

क्या **वैदेशिक-कार्य** मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि भारत छोड़ने से पहले पादरी माइकल स्कॉट ने विद्रोही नागाओं को कोई पत्र लिखा था ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो भारत में आने के समय से लेकर इस देश को छोड़ने के समय तक वह किस प्रकार की आपत्तिजनक गतिविधियों में भाग लेते रहे ;

(ग) क्या सरकार ने ब्रिटेन, जहां पादरी स्कॉट इस समय रह रहे हैं, की सरकार को इन गतिविधियों के बारे में सूचना भेज दी है ; और

(घ) यदि हां, तो उस सरकार ने क्या कार्यवाही की है ?

वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री (श्री स्वर्ण सिंह) : (क) सरकार के पास ऐसी कोई सूचना नहीं है ।

(ख) नागा प्रश्न को अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय रूप देने की कोशिश में रेवरेन्ट माइकल स्कॉट ने संयुक्त राष्ट्र प्रधान सचिव को तथा कुछ अन्य विदेशी सरकारों को पत्र लिखे थे । उन छिपे नागाओं को गिरफ्तार करने की, जो बर्मा प्रदेश में घुस गए थे, बर्मा सरकार की कार्रवाई के खिलाफ उन्होंने छिपे नागाओं की ओर से बर्मा सरकार के साथ लिखा-पढ़ी की । उन्होंने छिपे नागाओं द्वारा नागालैंड के लोगों से पैसा इकट्ठा करने को भी न्यायोचित ठहराने की कोशिश की थी ।

(ग) और (घ). रेव० माइकल स्कॉट को हानिकर गतिविधियों के कारण, भारत में उनकी उपस्थिति अवांछनीय समझी गई और उनसे कहा गया कि वह भारत छोड़ कर चले

जायें। यूनाइटेड किंगडम की सरकार को सूचना दे दी गई है। हमें मालूम नहीं कि उन्होंने कोई कार्रवाई की है ; और क्या की है ।

लाओस में सैनिक डाक्टर

2881. **श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :**
श्री रामेश्वरानन्द :
श्री रघुनाथ सिंह :

क्या **प्रतिरक्षा** मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि भारतीय सैनिक डाक्टरों ने लाओस में अब तक लगभग चौबीस हजार सैनिकों का इलाज किया है ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो लाओस में कितने भारतीय सैनिक डाक्टर हैं ;

(ग) क्या उन के द्वारा चलाये जा रहे अस्पतालों पर किये जाने वाले खर्च को सरकार वहन करती है ; और

(घ) यदि हां, तो अब तक इन अस्पतालों पर कितना खर्च किया गया है ?

प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय में राज्य-मंत्री (श्री अ० म० थांमस) : (क) भारतीय चिकित्सक दल ने मार्च, 1966 तक लाओस में लगभग 16,400 बाहर के रोगियों का इलाज किया और 800 भर्ती हुए रोगियों का ।

(ख) 20 फरवरी, 1966 तक 6 (5 सेना से और एक वायुसेना से) डाक्टरों ने सेवा की। 21 फरवरी, 1966 से डाक्टरों की संख्या (तीन सेना से और 1 वायु सेना से) 4 रही है ।

(ग) जी हां ।

(घ) अब तक कुल 6,00,140 रुपये खर्च हो चुके हैं ।

U.K. Move to ban Extradition of Commonwealth Citizens

2882. **Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:**
Shri M. L. Dwivedi:
Shri S. C. Samanta:
Shri Subodh Hansda:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether U.K. propose to ban extradition of Commonwealth citizens wanted for political offences; and

(b) whether Government propose to have similar law in India too?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) At the meeting of Commonwealth Law Ministers held in London from 26th April to 3rd May, 1966, a Scheme was formulated setting out principles which should form the basis of legislation regarding extradition of Commonwealth citizens within the Commonwealth. In that Scheme it was proposed that the return of a fugitive offender will be precluded by law if the competent judicial or executive authority is satisfied that the offence is an offence of a political character. We are not yet aware whether the U.K. proposes to enact legislation in the matter.

(b) The Extradition Act, 1962 (34 of 1962) contains provisions that a fugitive criminal shall not be surrendered or returned to a foreign State or Commonwealth country if the offence in respect of which the surrender is sought is of a political character. The Government have, therefore, no proposal to enact any further law in the matter.

Expansion of Television

2883. **Shri S. C. Samanta:**
Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:
Shri M. L. Dwivedi:
Shri Subodh Hansda:

Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state:

(a) the programme of expansion of television in India as envisaged in the Fourth Five-Year Plan;

(b) the progress made upto June, 1966 in this regard; and

(c) the expenditure incurred since its introduction?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) In the draft Fourth Five Year Plan, it is proposed to put up television stations at Bombay, Calcutta, Madras and Kanpur and carry out expansion of the T. V. Centre, Delhi.

(b) The Plan has not yet been approved. Preliminary work has, however, been taken up.

(c) The expenditure incurred on Television since its introduction up to the end of June, 1966, is Rs. 66.96 lakhs approximately.

Tenements for Ex-Servicemen

2884. **Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:**
Shri M. L. Dwivedi:
Shri Subodh Hansda:
Shri S. C. Samanta:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Delhi administration propose to build tenements for ex-servicemen; and

(b) if so, where and by what time?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) In the Naraina village. Two blocks are expected to be completed by October, 1967.

दिल्ली छावनी में ट्रक की दुर्घटना

2885. **श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :**
श्री भागवत झा आजाद :
श्री सोनावने :
श्री रघुनाथ सिंह :

क्या **रक्षा** मंत्री 9 मई, 1966 के अतारांकित प्रश्न संख्या 5017 के उत्तर के सम्बन्ध में यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या सरकार को दिल्ली छावनी में हुई ट्रक की दुर्घटना के कारणों के बारे में की गई न्यायिक जांच की रिपोर्ट प्राप्त हो गई है :

(ख) यदि हां, तो उस का ब्योरा क्या है ; और

(ग) इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार ने क्या कार्यवाही की है?

प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री (श्री यशवन्तराव चव्हाण) : (क) जी, नहीं ।

(ख) और (ग) यह प्रश्न इस अवस्था में नहीं उठते ।

Manufacture of Transmitting Tubes by B.E.L.

2886. **Shri B. K. Das:**
Shri Subodh Hansda:
Shri S. C. Samanta:
Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:
Shri M. L. Dwivedi:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Bharat Electronics Ltd., Bangalore are manufacturing transmitting tubes;

(b) if not, the steps being taken to manufacture these tubes;

(c) whether the Japanese machinery has been ordered for this purpose;

(d) if so, when these are likely to be installed; and

(e) when the production will start?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) and (b). An agreement has been entered into by Bharat Electronics Limited with a Japanese firm for the manufacture of Transmitting tubes under licence.

(c) to (e): Yes, Sir. Orders have already been placed for the machinery required for the production of Transmitting tubes. Some items have already arrived and the rest are expected to arrive by the end of 1966

Trial production is expected to be commenced by January, 1967 and regular production by June, 1967.

Awards to Officers of Information and Broadcasting Ministry

2887. **Shri Subodh Hansda:**
Shri S. C. Samanta:
Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:
Shri M. L. Dwivedi:

Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that some of the officers and staff of his Ministry have been awarded for stimulating new thinking in the A.I.R. in 1965-66;

(b) if so, the main features of the new thinking for which the awards were given; and

(c) the number of officers and staff who have received awards for this purpose?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) No, Sir.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

U.N. Committee on Outer Space

2888. Dr. M. M. Das: Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether there is a Committee called the United Nation's Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Outer Space;

(b) if so, the functions of the committee and its membership;

(c) whether India is also a member of the Committee; and

(d) whether the Thumba range for rocket launching in India is manged and maintained by the aforesaid international body?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c). Its functions are:

(I) To review, as appropriate, the area of international cooperation, and to study practical and feasible means for giving affect to programmes in the peaceful uses of outer space which could appropriately be undertaken under United Nations auspices, including, *inter alia;*

(i) Assistance for the continuation on the permanent basis of the research on outer space carried on within the framework of the International Geophysical Year;

(ii) Organization of the mutual exchange and dissemination of information on outer space research;

(iii) Encouragement of national research programmes for the study of outer space, and the rendering of all possible assistance and help towards their realization;

(II) To study the nature of legal problems which may arise from the exploration of outer space.

India is a member of the Committee. The other members are Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chad, Czechoslovakia, France, Hungary, Iran, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Poland, Rumania, Sierra Leone, Soviet Union, Sweden, the UAR, UK and the USA.

(d) The Thumba Equatorial Rocket Launching Station is under the administrative control of the Department of Atomic Energy of the Government of India. On the recommendation of the UN Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space the United Nations has granted its sponsorship to this Station in 1965.

केन्द्रीय मंत्रियों के दौरे

2889. **श्री विभूति मिश्र :** क्या प्रधान मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या सरकार ने देश के विभिन्न भागों में केन्द्रीय मंत्रियों के दौरों के सम्बन्ध

में कोई निश्चित सिद्धान्त और योजना बनाई है ;

(ख) क्या यह भी सच है कि स्वतन्त्रता प्राप्ति के बाद केन्द्रीय मंत्री कुछ विशेष स्थानों पर ही जाते रहे हैं और उन्होंने अन्य स्थानों की सर्वथा उपेक्षा की है ;

(ग) यदि हां, तो क्या सरकार का विचार मंत्रियों के दौरों के बारे में कोई नीति निर्धारित करने का है ; और

(घ) उसकी रूपरेखा क्या है ?

प्रधान मंत्री तथा अणु शक्ति मंत्री (श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी) : (क) और (ख). सरकार ने केन्द्रीय मंत्रियों के पर्यटन के नियमन के लिए कोई योजना अथवा कार्यविधि नहीं बनाई है । आवश्यकतानुसार अपने कर्त्तव्य-पालन के सम्बन्ध में मंत्रियों द्वारा देश के विभिन्न भागों का दौरा किया जाता है । किसी स्थान की उपेक्षा करने का प्रश्न ही नहीं उठता ।

(ग) इस समय इस सम्बन्ध में योजना बनाने का कोई प्रस्ताव नहीं है ।

(घ) प्रश्न ही नहीं उठता ।

रूस में भारतीय नागरिक

2890. **श्री रामसेवक यादव** : क्या **वैदेशिक-कार्य** मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) 1965–66 में रूस में कितने भारतीय नागरिक थे ;

(ख) उन में से कितने व्यक्तियों ने रूसी महिलाओं से विवाह किया था ;

(ग) क्या उन में से ऐसे व्यक्ति भी हैं जिन्होंने रूसी महिलाओं से विवाह करने से पहले अन्य देशों की महिलाओं से भी विवाह किया हुआ था ; और

(घ) यदि भाग (क) से (ग) में मांगी गई जानकारी उपलब्ध नहीं है, तो सरकार द्वारा ऐसा रिकार्ड न रखे जाने के क्या कारण हैं ?

वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री (श्री स्वर्ण सिंह) : (क) 950 (इनमें वे भारतीय राष्ट्रिक शामिल हैं, जो मास्को स्थित राजदूतावास में और ओडसा स्थित कौंसलावास में काम करते हैं, और उनके परिवार भी हैं) ।

(ख) 13 ।

(ग) विदेशों में रहने वाले सभी भारतीयों के विषय में सरकार के पास ऐसी कोई सूचना नहीं है ।

(घ) प्रश्न नहीं उठता ।

Mr. Bhutto's Statement on Indo-Pakistan War

2891. **Shri P. C. Borooah:**
Shri Bade:
Shri Hukam Chand Kachhavaiya:
Shri D. C. Sharma:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the statement of Mr. Z. A. Bhutto, the then Foreign Minister of Pakistan appearing in 'Urdu Digest' to the effect that Pakistan would fight another decisive war against India;

(b) if so, Government's reaction thereto in the context of Pakistan's failure to comply with the Tashkent Agreement; and

(c) the steps taken by Government to counter the allegations made in the statement against India?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) The June issue of the 'Urdu Digest' (Lahore) quoted Mr. Bhutto to the effect that Pakistan would fight a decisive battle if challenged again by India.

(b) and (c). On 8-6-1966, the Government lodged a protest with the Pakistan High Commission in new Delhi. However, the Pakistan High Commission has officially informed Government that the report as published was a distorted version, that the text of the interview had not been submitted for approval before publication and cannot be regarded as authentic. The available copy of this 'Urdu Digest' has been placed in the Library of the Parliament.

Properties of Sikh Gurdwaras in Pakistan

2892. Shri Gulshan:
Shri Daljit Singh:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) the total value of properties of Sikh Gurdwaras left in Pakistan;

(b) whether Government have received any representation in this connection recently; and

(c) if so, the contents of representation and action taken, if any?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) The S.G.P.C., Amritsar, claimed that the value of the properties attached to the Gurdwaras in Pakistan totalled a little over rupees 16 crores 18 lakhs in 1947.

(b) Copies of a representation by the Office of the S.G.P.C. to various Members of Parliament on the 20th April, 1966, have also been received by Government.

(c) The representation states: firstly that the Indian Government should take up with the Pakistan Government the question of the representation of the S.G.P.C. on the Wakf Board to manage the utilization of the income of Sikh Gurdwaras in Pakistan; and that the Government of India should persuade the Pakistan Government to entrust the control, management and utilization of the income of these Gurdwaras to the S.G.P.C.

Secondly that if this is not possible the properties belonging to the Muslim shrines in the Punjab should be handed over to the control of the S.G.P.C.

The question of having proper representation on the Wakf Board of West Pakistan and the allied questions regarding Sikh Gurdwaras and their property have been raised on a number of occasions with the Pakistan Government without receiving any satisfactory response. Government propose to keep on pursuing with Pakistan this matter of the proper maintenance and management of Gurdwaras in Pakistan.

Wakf properties in India are utilised for such purposes as have been dedicated by the founder. They cannot be managed by any authority other than that appointed by the Wakf and the suggestion of the S.G.P.C. for transference of the control of Wakf properties in Punjab to them is not permissible under the Wakf Act, 1954.

Punjabi Programme of A.I.R. Jullundur

2893. Shri Gulshan: Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Punjabi Programme of A.I.R. Jullundur is not of the requisite standard; and

(b) if so, the steps taken for standardization and improvement of Programme?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

Meeting of State Directors of Information

2894. Shri Bibhuti Mishra:
Shri P. R. Chakraverti:
Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:
Shri Daljit Singh:
Shri Hem Raj:

Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a meeting of State Directors of Information

was held in Delhi on the 6th and 7th June, 1966 under his Chairmanship;

(b) if so, the subjects discussed thereat; and

(c) the steps taken to reform States Information Services?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) Yes, Sir. The Meeting was held under the Chairmanship of the Secretary, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. Minister of Information and Broadcasting inaugurated the Meeting.

(b) The subjects discussed related to important matters pertaining to co-ordination of effort, optimum utilisation of resources in personnel and equipment and strategy of publicity programmes in the context of the role the information media are called upon to play with the commencement of the Fourth Plan etc. The question of greater and more effective collaboration between the Centre and the States in conducting important publicity campaigns like family planning, increased agricultural production, export promotion etc. and coordination of publicity efforts in the media of broadcasaing, films, press, publications, field publicity song and drama etc. were also discussed. The publicity requirements in border areas and the need for strengthening the publicity machinery therefore were also considered.

(c) No such subject was discussed at the Meeting of the State Directors of Information.

Modern Weapons

2895. Shri Bibhuti Mishra: Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the report in the 'Indian Nation' of the 6th June, 1966 published from Patna regarding modern weapons;

(b) if so, whether there is any shortage of modern weapons;

(c) whether there is any difficulty in obtaining such weapons; and

(d) the assistance which Government expect from the nation to obtain modern weapons for the country's defence?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) We are re-equipping the Defence Services with modern, standardised weapons but considering the range and variety of modern weapons required, some shortage exist which will be removed over a period of time.

(c) and (d). Modern, sophisticated weapons cannot be obtained from other countries easily within the time and in quantities required by us. We shall, therefore, have to use our talent and resources, specially in the field of Scientific research in keeping our weapons modern and up-to-date. Scientific research in the country has to keep abreast of technological developments in weaponry in other countries and engineering technology and machine tools manufacture has to advance rapidly to facilitate indigenous manufacture of modern weapons.

Hindustan Aeronautics Ltd., Kanpur

2896. Shri S. M. Banerjee: Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether conversion of posts of those employees who were working under the Indian Air Force at Kanpur has taken place in the Hindustan Aeronautics, Kanpur during 1966;

(b) if so, whether salaries of all those employees have been duly protected; and

(c) if not, the number of employees whose salaries have not been protected?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) Yes, Sir. Conversion offers to IAF employees serving in HAL Kanpur for absorption in the Company scales have been made. These are

under consideration of the IAF employees.

(b) Yes, Sir. The pay of the IAF employees has been protected, as on 1-6-1964, the date of conversion.

(c) Does not arise.

South-East Asia Cooperation Union

2897. **Shri Madhu Limaye:**
Shri Kishen Pattnayak:
Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:
Shrimati Renuka Barkataki:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government was invited to join the South-East Asia Cooperation Union consisting of Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia and Phillippines;

(b) what will be the scope of this cooperation and union; and

(c) the reaction of Government thereto?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) No, Sir. The Government is not aware of such a Union consisting of Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia and Philippines.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

वाडी में प्रतिरक्षा परियोजना में विस्फोट

2898. **श्री बड़े :**
श्री हकम चन्द कछवाय :

क्या **रक्षा** मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि

(क) क्या यह सच है कि 9 जून, 1966 को नागपुर के निकट वाडी में प्रतिरक्षा परियोजना में हुए विस्फोट के फलस्वरूप एक व्यक्ति मारा गया था और 7 व्यक्ति घायल हुये थे ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो विस्फोट किन कारणों से हुआ ; और

(ग) क्या उनमें कुछ असैनिक लोग भी थे?

प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय में राज्य-मंत्री (श्री अ० म० थानप्त): (क) से (ग). हमें सूचना मिली है कि सर्वश्री इण्डस इंजीनियरिंग कम्पनी के श्रमिक शिविर में जो नागपुर के निकट अम्बझरी में रक्षा प्रायोजना के असैनिक कामिकों के लिए महाराष्ट्र सरकार द्वारा नियुक्त किए गए ठेकेदार हैं, 9-6-66 को प्रातः एक विस्फोट हुआ था, श्रमिक शिविर रक्षा प्रायोजना के सत्ताक्षेत्र से बाहर स्थित है, और विस्फोट रक्षा प्रायोजना से सम्बन्धित नहीं है ।

Manufacture of Farm Planes at HAL

2899. **Shri P. C. Borooah:**
Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:
Shri Surendra Pal Singh:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Hindustan Aircraft Limited, Bangalore has been entrusted with the work of manufacturing about 200 aircraft for the Ministry of Agriculture;

(b) if so, the salient features of the aircraft; and

(c) the cost per aircraft and how it compares with the imported ones with corresponding specifications?

The Minister of Sate in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) Hindustan Aircraft Limited, Bangalore has undertaken the design of an aircraft for aerial spraying and crop dusting required by the Ministry of Food and Agriculture. The number of aircraft to be manufactured will be determined after satisfactory progress has been made in the design of the aircraft.

(b) A light dual seater, the aircraft is proposed to be designed for operations from short unprepared strips, with a capacity to carry 1200 lbs. of spraying material. The cruising speed will be of the order of 80 to 90 M.P.H. and the range of the order of 400 nautical miles.

(c) It is too early to make a reliable estimate of the cost of the aircraft, but the preliminary indications are that it would compare favourably with the cost of an imported aircraft of comparable performance.

Import of Radios under PL 480

2900. Shri P. C. Borooah: Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Shri A. K. Chanda, Chairman of the Committee on Information and Broadcasting media has suggested import of about 2 million cheap radio sets on the basis of PL 480 imports; and

(b) if so, Government's reaction thereto?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The suggestion was examined but it was decided, after careful consideration, that instead of importing the sets, the capacity of the radio industry within the country should be augmented. The question of augmenting is being pursued with the Ministries of Industry and Finance and the Planning Commission.

Bharat Electronics Ltd., Bangalore

2901. Shri Buta Singh:
Shri Narasimha Reddy:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Bharat Electronics Ltd., Bangalore have decided to enter the export trade; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) and (b). Bharat Electronics Limited are interested in developing an export market for their products but their capacity for manufacture of electronic equipment is at present engaged in meeting the requirements of the Defence and other security Services. In the case of components, i.e. Radio Receiving Valves, Transistors/Diodes, Capacitors and Crystals, their present production is less than even the domestic demand. Proposals to expand the capacity for the manufacture of components are under consideration. Having regard to the necessity to earn foreign exchange by initiating exports of their products BEL have been taking suitable steps *e.g.* participation in exhibitions held abroad and they propose to further intensify this activity, to advertise the components and equipment manufactured by them with a view to entering the export trade as soon as practicable.

I.A.F. Plane Accident at Bamrauli

2902. Shri P. C. Borooah:
Shri Kindar Lal:
Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:
Shri Gulshan:
Shri Narasimha Reddy:
Shri Ram Harkh Yadav:
Shri Basumatari:
Shri Onkar Lal Berwa:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that two trainer aircrafts of the I.A.F. pilot training establishment collided at Bamrauli in mid-air on the 17th June, 1966;

(b) if so, in what circumstances; and

(c) the number of persons killed?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) An aircraft flown solo by a Flight Cadet pupil converged on and crashed into another aircraft which was being flown by a flying instructor and his pupil. A Court of Inquiry has investigated the accident and the circumstances of the collision will be known when its proceedings are finalised.

(c) The Flying Instructor and both pupils were killed.

Manufacture of Marine Diesel Engines

2903. Shrimati Renuka Barkataki:
Shri Baswant:
Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government have accepted a proposal to manufacture marine diesel engines at the Heavy Engineering Corporation, Ranchi; and

(b) if so, the main features thereof?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) The recommendation regarding Ranchi as the location is under consideration. The factory will be part of the Garden Reach Workshops.

(b) The proposal now under the consideration of the Government envisages the supply of heavy castings, forgings and heavy machined items from the HEC, Ranchi and some other components by other manufacturers in the country. The final assembly and testing and manufacture of the balance of the components not to be made elsewhere will be in the new facility to be set up. The production programme envisaged is:

Type of Engine	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III
KZ	4	6	8
GV	30	45	60
RV	50	75	100

Statement of Former Prime Minister of Japan

2904. Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:
Shri Hem Barua:
Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:
Shri Nath Pai:
Shri Alvares:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the attention of Government has been drawn to a recent statement by the former Japanese Prime Minister, Mr. Kishi, at the opening of the Asian Parliamentary Union Preparatory Conference meeting appearing in the *Times of India*, Bombay Edition, dated the 1st June, 1966 calling for the unity of Asian peoples against China's new threat of nuclear weapons;

(b) whether India was represented at the Conference;

(c) if so, what was the Indian delegate's stand; and

(d) Government's considered reaction to Mr. Kishi's call?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir. In his speech Mr. Kishi referred to the new threat of nuclear weapons from China and said that "the only way to save Asia from this political crisis is for the Asian peoples to be united by one common objective and reconstruct their countries so that they may not be swayed by any schemes of Communists, thereby getting rid of poverty at the earliest possible date."

(b) and (c). No, Sir.

(d) The Government of India are of the view that Asian unity and development for eradicating poverty ought to be the common objective of the peoples of Asia. The Government believe that such unity and development, as distinct from the approach of military alliances and ideological blocs, is the best defence against the threat posed by Chinese expansionism.

Alloy Steel Plant at Kanpur

2905. Shri Ramachandra Ulaka:
Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 1706 on the 16th May, 1966 and state:

(a) whether any decision has since been taken to establish a special Alloy Steel Plant at Kanpur; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) and (b). As indicated in answer to Lok Sabha Starred Question No. 1706 of 16th May, 1966, the scope and pattern of facilities for alloy steel production at Kanpur has to be related to the production capabilities under development in other Steel Plants in the Public and Private Sectors. As the latter are still under examination, it has not so far been possible to finalise the scope and extent of facilities to be set up at Kanpur.

Tibetan Industrial Rehabilitation Society

2906. Shri Ramachandra Ulaka:
Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 3498 on the 11th April, 1966 and state:

(a) whether the Tibetan Industrial Rehabilitation Society has submitted any schemes to Government; and

(b) if so, the reaction of Government thereto?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Government of India view the schemes with sympathy, and will help expedite their implementation in suitable ways. It is a private company and no financial assistance from Government sources is contemplated.

New Medals for Armed Forces

2907. Shri Ramachandra Ulaka:
Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 5659 on the 16th May, 1966 and state:

(a) whether the proposal for the institution of new medals for the Armed Forces personnel has since been considered; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) and (b). The proposal is still under consideration.

Medium Wave Transmitters at Varanasi

2908. Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:
Shri Ramachandra Ulaka:

Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 3841 on the 18th April, 1966 and state:

(a) whether the proposals to further or extend the coverage of the medium wave transmitter at Varanasi and the augmentation of studio facilities at Lucknow have since been considered; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) and (b). The Fourth Five Year Plan for development of Broadcasting has not yet been approved and until then it is not possible to furnish further details about Varanasi and Lucknow.

Passports for U.S.A. and U.S.S.R.

2909. Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:
Shri Ramachandra Ulaka:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of passports issued for U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. since 26th April, 1966;

(b) the number of applications received during the above period; and

(c) the number of applications rejected during the above period?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) 4888.

(b) 4892.

(c) 1. The above figures pertain to the period from 26-4-66 to 31-7-66.

Resettlement of Ex-servicemen in Border Areas

2910. Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:
Shri Ramachandra Ulaka:

Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 4989 on the 9th May, 1966 and state:

(a) whether the suggestions for the resettlement of ex-servicemen in some border areas have since been considered by Government; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) and (b). Proposals for settling ex-servicemen in certain border areas in compact blocks where land is available are under consideration of the Central Government in consultation with the State Governments. Schemes for Tripura and NEFA have, however, been sanctioned and the facilities to be provided to the settlers under these schemes are as follows:

(1) Free transport for self and family from the residential place to the settlement.

(2) Free grant of land for agriculture, homestead and kitchen garden.

(3) Free residential accommodation at the initial stage.

(4) Provision of basic amenities like roads, water supply, sanitation, dispensaries, schools, etc., in settlement areas free of cost.

(5) Financial assistance in the form of free grants and loans for house-building, maintenance of self and family for a few initial years, and procurement of the requisite household effects, agricultural implements, livestock, seeds, manures, etc.

कैलाश और मानसरोवर पर भारत का दावा

2911. श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री :
श्री हरि विष्णु कामत :
श्री मधु लिमये :
श्री राम सेवक यादव :

क्या वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या प्रधान मंत्री ने हाल में पिथौरागढ़ में अपने भाषण में कैलाश और मानसरोवर पर भारत के दावे का उल्लेख किया था ;

(ख) क्या इस सम्बन्ध में चीन सरकार को कोई पत्र भी भेजा गया है ;

(ग) कैलाश और मानसरोवर के कुल कितने भाग पर भारत अपना दावा रखना चाहता है ; और

(घ) क्या यह भी सच है कि कैलाश और मानसरोवर से परे भी कुछ गांव हैं जहां से भारत सरकार लगान वसूल किया करती थी ?

वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री (श्री स्वर्ण सिंह) : (क) प्रधान मंत्री ने यह बयान नहीं दिया । जिस समाचार एजेंसी ने यह विशेष रिपोर्ट भेजी थी, उसका ध्यान इस गलती की ओर आकर्षित किया गया था हालांकि औपचारिक रूप से उसका खण्डन नहीं किया गया ।

(ख) प्रश्न नहीं उठता ।

(ग) भारत को सदियों से परम्परागत रूप में कैलाश तथा मानसरोवर की तीर्थ यात्रा जैसे कुछ धार्मिक अधिकार प्राप्त रहे हैं । भारत और चीन के बीच वर्तमान सम्बन्धों को ध्यान में रखते हुए इन अधिकारों का उपयोग रोक दिया गया है । लेकिन जब

कभी दोनों देशों के बीच बातचीत होगी, तब इस मसले को भी चीन के साथ तय किया जाएगा। इन क्षेत्रों के बारे में कोई प्रादेशिक विवाद नहीं है।

(घ) जी, हां। कैलाश के पश्चिम और मानसरोवर के उत्तर में स्थित भारतीय बस्ती मिनसार में जम्मू तथा काश्मीर सरकार को बहुत समय से कुछ प्रभुत्व अधिकार प्राप्त रहे हैं जिनमें मालगुजारी वसूल करने के अधिकार भी शामिल हैं। हाल के वर्षों में उस बस्ती पर चीनियों द्वारा कब्जा कर लिये जाने के कारण इन अधिकारों का प्रयोग नहीं किय जा सका है और वे अधिकार भी भारत और चीन के बीच के मुख्य विवाद का अंग हैं।

सैनिक ट्रक की दुर्घटना

2912. श्री बड़े :
श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :
श्री ओंकार लाल बेरवा :
श्री काशी राम गुप्त :

क्या रक्षा मंत्री 25 अप्रैल, 1966 के अतारांकित प्र न संख्या 4322 के उत्तर के सम्बन्ध में यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या सरकार को 30 मार्च, 1966 को हुई सैनिक ट्रक दुर्घटना के बारे में रिपार्ट मिल गई है ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो उसका ब्यौरा क्या है; और

(ग) यदि नहीं, तो प्रतिवेदन कब मिलने की सम्भावना है ?

प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय में राज्य-मंत्री (श्री ज० म० थामस) : (क) जी नहीं। कोर्ट आव इन्क्वायरी की अन्तिम रिपोर्ट अभी प्रतीक्षित है।

(ख) प्रश्न नहीं उठता ।

(ग) कोर्ट आव इन्क्वायरी का परिणाम शीघ्र प्राप्त होने की आशा है।

Hunza Principality of Jammu and Kashmir

2913. Shri Gulshan: Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that some portion of Hunza Principality of Jammu and Kashmir State has been forcibly occupied by the Chinese Government; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) and (b). Government have seen press reports to this effect. Under the so-called Sino-Pakistan "Agreement" of 1963, Pakistan ceded to China 2050 sq. miles of Indian territory in Pakistan-occupied Kashmir. A portion of this territory belongs to the Hunza Principality (of the State of Jammu and Kashmir) which is under the illegal occupation of Pakistan. Government have no information whether Chinese have forcibly occupied any further territory in Pakistan-occupied Kashmir.

Transfers of Cantonment Officers

2914. Shri A. N. Vidyalankar: Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the National Industrial Tribunal No. 2 of 1958 had recommended in its Award (Para 24) that the supervisory staff and sectional heads should be transferred from Cantonment to Cantonment and necessary rules were to be framed for the purpose;

(b) whether it is also a fact that no action has so far been taken in this behalf, although nearly six years have elapsed; and

(c) whether Government propose to take any action in this direction and if so, what and when?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) In para 34 of its Award, the National Industrial Tribunal had observed that in the interests of efficiency it would be desirable that the supervisory staff of Cantonment Boards and sectional heads should be transferable from Cantonment to Cantonment, at least within a State, and may be within a Command. The Tribunal had further suggested that the transfers should be based upon desiderata to be fixed by Rules.

(b) and (c). Action to amend the Cantonment Fund Servants Rules 1937 incorporating provisions therein, relating to transfer of Cantonment Board staff, has been initiated. The Gazette notification inviting objections|suggestions to the proposed amendments is expected to be published shortly.

Voluntary Military Service

2915. Shri M. R. Krishna: Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any studies have been undertaken in India with a view to consider the question of induction of younger age groups for voluntary military service for a few years; and

(b) whether Government are contemplating modification or introduction of fresh schemes to draft younger age groups for active service?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) and (b). Recruitment to Armed Forces has always been on voluntary basis and the period of active service was limited to a few years in the case of personnel other than officers to ensure a young Army. After the Chinese aggression studies were made and the age limits for recruitment of Other Ranks in the Army were reduced to from 17 to 25 to 17 to 21. As regards Officers, the recruitment age is already low but a Short Service Commission for 5 years followed by a reserve liability of 10 years has been introduced for officer class in the Army. No further modification in the age limit for recruitment either for the officers or for Other Ranks is contemplated.

Rev. Michael Scott's Letter to the Prime Minister

2916. Shri D. C. Sharma: Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Rev. Michael Scott, a member of the now defunct Nagaland Peace Mission, has written a letter to the Prime Minister recently;

(b) if so, the contents and purpose thereof; and

(c) the action taken in the matter?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) and (b). Rev. Michael Scott since he left India has written two letters to the Prime Minister. The letter dated 22-6-1966 is a request for return of his papers and other documents seized from him at the time of his expulsion. The second letter of 15th July, 1966 is a letter forwarding his recent pamphlet —The Nagas—India's problem or the World's?

(c) Rev. Michael Scott's request for return of his documents is under consideration.

Memorandum Submitted by an Official of External Affairs Ministry to Pillai Committee

2917. Shri A. K. Gopalan:
Shri Dasaratha Deb:
Shri Dinen Bhattacharya:
Shri M. N. Swamy:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a senior official of his Ministry in a memorandum to the N. R. Pillai Committee has brought serious charges against a section of the officialdom for "sacrificing the principles of larger interests of administration and our country";

(b) if so, whether Government have considered the implications of this memorandum; and

(c) the measures Government propose to take to end such activities to ensure national interest?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a), (b) and (c). Yes, Sir. The opinions expressed in the memorandum by an IFS Officer to the Committee headed by Shri N. R. Pillai, are entirely subjective and flow from certain grievances, real or imaginary, of the officer. But the publication of this memorandum in the Press, which is regrettable, makes it necessary to state that the sweeping allegations, particularly against a section of the IFS, are unwarranted.

The Government are, of course, fully alive to the need for reviewing the Foreign Service to see how it can be further strengthened and improved to meet the needs of India in a dynamic and changing world. The IFS Committee, appointed for this purpose, is making a thorough examination of all memoranda including this memorandum. Government will consider the Committee's recommendations as soon as they are available.

Chinese Threat in the Indian Ocean

2918. Shri Hem Raj: Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Chinese threat in the Indian Ocean is developing; and

(b) if so, the steps being taken to counteract?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) and (b). Appreciation of the Chinese threat in the Indian Ocean and other parts is made by Government from time to time. Suitable steps are being taken to strengthen the Navy. It is not in the public interest to disclose the plans of the Government in this regard.

Publicity on Devaluation

2919. Shri Buta Singh:
Shri Narasimha Reddy:

Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the attention of Government has been drawn to a Press report appearing in The Nation Weekly of the 10th July, 1966, saying that his Ministry invited the Financial Editors in Delhi to explain devaluation and the only work done was to provide them with sufficient liquor and not the publicity material; and

(b) if so, the nature of hospitality provided to them by Government during their stay in the Capital?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The only hospitality shown by Government during the three-day discussions between the Editors and Ministers and Secretaries of various Departments, was to invite them to dinner or lunch or reception. No money was spent by Government on their travel or stay in Delhi.

International Control Commission in Vietnam

2920. Shri Shree Narayan Das: Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the International Control Commission in Vietnam is proposed to be expanded and made more effective there;

(b) if so, whether India has been consulted in this regard; and

(c) if so, Government's reaction thereto?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) and (b). Government of India have received no such proposal.

(c) Does not arise now.

Disciplinary Proceedings against Army Personnel

2921. Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Will the Minister of Defence be pleased to state:

(a) whether disciplinary proceedings against the three Army Personnel held to be responsible for an attempt to molest a woman and causing death of three civilians near Berubari in West Bengal in May, 1966 have been completed; and

(b) if so, the results thereof?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Out of the four accused Army personnel, three who were found guilty have been suitably punished. The fourth one, who was not found guilty, has been acquitted.

Travel of an Indian on Forged Passport

2922. Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 4314 on the 25th April, 1966 and state:

(a) whether enquiry in the matter of travel of Sarwan Singh son of Shri Rattan Singh of Jullundur under the assumed name of Davendrakumar son of Shri Mohan Lal, from Palam to London on a forged British passport on the 30th December, 1965 has been completed;

(b) the results of the enquiry; and

(c) the particulars of persons responsible for issue of the false passport and for allowing him to fly with the same?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) to (c). The case is still under investigation and will require time for completion of enquiries, since such enquiries are to be completed in foreign countries where the forged passport was issued and impounded.

Tribunal on Kutch Dispute

2923. Shri Ram Harkh Yadav: Will the Minister of External Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) the Session and Venue of the International Tribunal on the Kutch dispute between India and Pakistan;

(b) whether a team of different types of experts and specialists will represent India before the Tribunal; and

(c) the name of the Cantonment team?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) The Tribunal will commence hearing of the case at Geneva on 15th September, 1966.

(b) and (c). The question of the composition of the delegation is under consideration.

भारतीय भाषाओं के प्रयोग के बारे में भारतीय दूतावासों के कर्मचारियों को हिदायतें

2924. **श्री जगदेव सिंह सिद्धान्ती :** क्या वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री 28 मार्च, 1966 के अतारांकित प्रश्न संख्या 822 के उत्तर के सम्बन्ध में यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि क्या सरकार का विचार विदेशों में स्थित भारतीय दूतावासों के अधिकारियों अथवा कर्मचारियों को ये हिदायतें जारी करने का है कि वे विदेशों में रहते हुए आपस में बातचीत केवल भारतीय भाषाओं में ही किया करें ?

वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री (श्री स्वर्ण सिंह) : बातचीत की भाषा को सरकारी निदेशों का विषय नहीं बनाया जा सकता । वास्तव में, विदेशों में भारतीय कर्मचारी सुविधानुसार आपस में भारतीय भाषाओं में बातचीत करते हैं ।

भारतीय दूतावासों के लिये हिन्दी के समाचार-पत्र तथा पत्रिकायें

2925. **श्री जादेव सिंह सिद्धान्ती:** क्या वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री 28 फरवरी, 1966 के अतारांकित प्रश्न संख्या 1223 के उत्तर के सम्बन्ध में यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि जिन भारतीय दूतावासों को हिन्दी के समाचार पत्र तथा पत्रिकाएं नहीं मिलती हैं उनको हिन्दी के समाचार पत्र तथा पत्रिकाएं देने के लिए क्या प्रबन्ध किया गया है अथवा करने का विचार है ?

वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री (श्री स्वर्ण सिंह): आम तौर पर मिशन स्वयं तय करते हैं कि वे कौन समाचार पत्र या पत्रिकाएं मंगाएं। मंत्रालय ने मिशनों से कहा है कि वे अपने यहां काम करने वाले कर्मचारियों तथा ऐसे विदेशियों के लाभ के लिए, जो हिन्दी जानते हों या हिन्दी सीखने में रुचि रखते हों, हिन्दी के समाचार-पत्र/पत्रिकाएं मंगाएं । 61 मिशनों में से, जो कि फरवरी, 1966 में हिन्दी समाचार पत्र नहीं मंगा रहे थे, 25 मिशनों ने ये पत्र/पत्रिकाएं लेने का प्रबन्ध कर लिया है । कुछ मिशनों ने, जो हिन्दी की पुस्तिकाएं और पत्रिकाएं प्राप्त करते हैं, हिन्दी समाचार पत्र मंगाने में अपनी असमर्थता प्रकट की है——कुछ ने तो इसके लिए कि वहां हिन्दी जानने वाला कोई कर्मचारी नहीं है और कुछ के पास धन की कमी है । अन्य मिशनों से उत्तर की प्रतीक्षा की जा रही है ।

Development Workshop of Indian Statistical Institute, Calcutta

2926. **Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to refer to the reply given to Unstarred Question No. 863 on the 1st August, 1966 and state:

(a) the reasons for retrenchment being undertaken before the Reviewing Committee, set up by Government, has submitted its report;

(b) whether it is a fact that U.N.T.A.A grant has been withheld from the Indian Statistical Institute leading to the closure of the Development Workshop of the Indian Statistical Institute; and

(c) the reasons for which the grant has not been renewed?

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): (a) to (c). The workshop of the Indian Statistical Institute was being financed by Government mainly for development work connected with the Institute's proposed project for the commercial manufacture of calculating machines and allied equipment, with the aid of certain machinery received by it from U.S.S.R. as part of U.N. technical assistance to the Government of India. However, when it was found on examination of the project report that it might not be possible to run the project profitably, Government decided not to make further outlays on the project and discontinued grants for the workshop. This decision was taken and communicated to the Institute long before the appointment of the Review Committee. As it had become obvious that the project would not come up as a successful commercial venture, it was not considered necessary to await finalisation of the work of the Committee in closing down the workshop at postponement of decision on this might result in wasteful expenditure.

Rioting in Cossipore Gun and Shell Factory

2927. **Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether there was rioting in the area surrounding the Gun and Shell

Factory, Cossipore, West Bengal involving many workers of the factory in May, 1966;

(b) if so, whether a Departmental Enquiry has been held by factory management and if so, the findings of the enquiry;

(c) whether any relief or compensation has been paid to the workers whose houses were burnt down; and

(d) whether any help has been rendered to the families of those who lost their lives in the fracas?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) A Fact Finding Board was constituted to investigate into the incidents which occurred within the factory premises only. The report of the Board has been received in the Ministry and is under consideration.

(c) Yes, Sir. Payment of Rs. 6,919.75 has so far been made as a measure of relief to the affected employees including those whose houses were burnt down.

(d) A sum of Rs. 2,300 as detailed below has been given to the widow of the only factory employee who lost his life:—

(i) from the DGOF's General Fund.	Rs. 1,000
(ii) from the Shahaney Memorial Trust Fund.	Rs. 1,000
(iii) from the G&SF Labour Welfare Fund.	Rs. 300

I.A.F. Plane accident near Poona

2928. **Shri Dighe:**
Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:
Shri Bade:
Shri Hukam Chand Kachhavaiya:
Shri Sonavane:
Shri Y. D. Singh:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that some Officers were killed when two I.A.F. planes collieded in mid-air near Poona on the 7th July, 1966;

(b) if so, the total number of deaths; and

(c) the causes of the accident?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Two IAF officers were killed.

(c) The accident was due to mid-air collision. A Court of Inquiry has been ordered to investigate the accident. The cause of the accident will be known when the report of the Court of Inquiry is received.

Indian Government Personnel in Nepal

2929. **Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:**
Shri Dighe:
Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that several Indian Government personnel serving in Nepal on deputation or whose services have been loaned to the Nepal Government have refused to draw their pay as a protest against the delay on the part of their parent departments in taking decision on their demand for compensating them for the loss in their emoluments following devaluation; and

(b) if so, the reaction of Government thereto?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) There are Government of India personnel serving in Nepal—in the Indian Embassy and in the Indian Aid Mission—as well as certain other personnel working in Nepal and directly under the control of their respective Departments. These latter are from the Posts and Telegraphs Department and from the Ministry of Civil Aviation working in the Meteorological Unit

and the Aero-Communication Centre in Kathmandu, and there was delay in their receiving instructions on compensation consequent on devaluation. The staff of the Meteorological Unit did not draw their salaries pending receipt of instructions.

(b) Necessary action was taken immediately by this Ministry in respect of entitled personnel in the Embassy and the Indian Aid Mission under its administrative control and suitable instructions were issued on the 8th June 1966. As regards those working under the administrative control of other Ministries and Departments, necessary action was taken to draw their attention for issuing similar instructions. This Ministry has since been informed that the Posts and Telegraphs staff have received necessary instructions and our Embassy in Kathmandu has informed us that they have since been paid exchange compensation allowance. The Ministry of Civil Aviation have also since issued suitable instructions to compensate their staff in the Meteorological Unit and the Aero-Communication Centre.

Accident to Sea Hawk Aircraft

2930. **Shri Panna Lal:**
Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:
Shri Brij Basi Lal:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a Sea Hawk aircraft belonging to I.N.S. Vikrant operating from the Meenambakkam airport met with an accident on the 20th July, 1966;

(b) if so, the causes of the accident; and

(c) the action taken by Government thereon?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) and (c). A Board of Enquiry has been convened to investigate the cause of the accident.

Labour Welfare Offices in Cantonment Boards

2931. **Shri A. N. Vidyalankar:** Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) the names and number of Cantonment Boards that employ more than 500 workmen;

(b) whether all such Boards have appointed Labour Welfare Officers as required by the law;

(c) the name of the Cantonment Board where such officers have not been appointed; and

(d) the steps taken by Government to get the officers appointed?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) The following 10 Cantonment Boards employ more than 500 workmen:—

Agra, Ambala, Meerut, Lucknow, Kanpur, Mhow, Ferozepur, Jullundur, Poona and Secunderabad.

(b) The Cantonment Boards are not required by law to appoint Labour Welfare Officers unless they run factories ordinarily employing 500 or more workers. There is no such Cantonment Board.

(c) and (d). Do not arise.

Labour Welfare Officers in Cantonment Boards

2932. **Shri A. N. Vidyalankar:** Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Cantonment Boards employing more than 500 workmen are required to appointment Labour Welfare Officers under the Labour Laws and regulations;

(b) whether it is a fact that the Cantonment Boards of Ambala and Meerut resolved to appoint such Officers at their expense and asked for

the posting of Labour Welfare Officers from the Central Pool; and

(c) if so, the reasons why the Welfare Officers have not yet been appointed in these two Cantonment Boards?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A M. Thomas): (a) Cantonment Boards running factories ordinarily employing 500 or more workers are required to employ Welfae Officers in such factories. There is however no such Cantonment Board.

(b) No, Sir.

(c) Does not arise.

कांग्रेस अध्यक्ष की मास्को यात्रा

2933. **श्री बड़े :**
श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :
श्री सोनावने :
श्री यू० व० सिंह :

क्या वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) कांग्रेस अध्यक्ष को उनकी मास्को यात्रा के लिए कितनी विदेशी मुद्रा दी गई;

(ख) क्या वह सरकारी दौरे पर मास्को गये हैं ; और

(ग) यदि नहीं, तो क्या उनको वहां की सरकार ने आमन्त्रित किया था ?

वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री (श्री स्वर्ण सिंह) : (क) कांग्रेस के अध्यक्ष को सोवियत संघ तथा अन्य पूर्व यूरोपीय देशों की यात्रा करने के लिए 1000 रुपये के बराबर की विदेशी मुद्रा दी गई थी ।

(ख) उनकी सोवियत संघ तथा अन्य पूर्व यूरोपीय देशों की यात्रा सरकारी यात्रा नहीं थी; वह कांग्रेस संगठन क अध्यक्ष की हैसियत से वहां गए थे ।

(ग) जी हां । सोवियत समाजवादी गणतन्त्र संघ की सरकार ने उन्हें सोवियत संघ आने का निमंत्रण दिया था ।

Indo-Kuwait Ventures

2934. **Shri Dighe:**
Shri P. C. Borooah:
Shri Onkar Lal Berwa:
Shri Vishwa Nath Pandey:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether a Joint Committee of India and Kuwait recently discussed possibilities of Indo-Kuwait ventures; and

(b) if so, with what results?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) At its first meeting held in New Delhi between 27th and 30th June, 1966, the Joint Committee decided to examine further possibilities of joint ventures both in India and Kuwait, as also fields in which technical and economic cooperation between the countries could be developed and further strengthened. The industries identified in which joint ventures are possible and which are to be examined further are the manufacture of fertilisers in India and the establishment of an Iron and Steel plant, and Aluminium plant and a Cement plant in Kuwait.

Recruitment to Airmen

2935. **Shri Gulshan:** Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether his Ministry propose to recognise Higher Secondary Part I as equivalent to Matriculation for appointment to Airmen, Technical and non-technical grades in the Indian Air Force and other departments; and

(b) if not, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) and (b). The question whether the Higher Secondary Part I examination should be recognised as equivalent to Matriculation examination for the purpose of employment under the Government of India is under the consideration of the Government.

External Publicity Division

2936. Shri Onkar Lal Berwa: Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that despite its failure in projecting the true image of India abroad, the External Publicity Division is being maintained at heavy cost; and

(b) if so, why the repeated demands to merge this Department with the internal publicity set up have been turned down time and again?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Government do not accept the premise on the basis of which the question is framed. On the contrary, within their limited resources the External Publicity Division of the Ministry of External Affairs have been performing their duties creditably.

(b) It is the considered view of the Government that, as the conduct of external publicity raises special problems, the External Publicity Division should function as a separate unit. Close liaison is, however, maintained with the various media units of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting.

Film Industry

2937. Shri Onkar Lal Berwa: Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that film industry is a losing concern in respect of foreign exchange;

(b) if so, whether it is also a fact that this industry lost foreign exchange heavily last year;

(c) if so, how much was the loss; and

(d) the foreign exchange allocation for this industry during the current year?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) to (c). The actual exports of cinematograph films, exposed, during the last three years are as under:

1963-64	..	Rs. 2,12,81,941
1964-65	..	Rs. 1,98,68,960
1965-66	..	Rs. 1,63,93,766

There has been a fall in exports of cinematograph films, exposed, to the extent of Rs. 34,75,194 during 1965-66 as compared to the previous year.

(d) The availability of cinematograph films, not exposed, to the film industry during the current licensing period from free resources and rupee sources is estimated at Rs. 184 lakhs.

प्रचार के नये तरीके

2938. **श्री ओंकार लाल बेरवा** : क्या सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या दृश्य तथा विज्ञापन प्रचार के कोई नये तरीके अपनाये गये हैं ; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो उनका ब्यौरा क्या है ?

सूचना तथा प्रसारण मंत्री (श्री राज बहादुर) : (क) तथा (ख). परिवार नियोजन आन्दोलन के सजावटी विज्ञापन को जांचने का एक तरीका अपनाया गया है इसके अनुसार विज्ञापन पहले कुछ स्थानों के पत्रों में दिये जाते हैं और फिर कूपनों के द्वारा प्राप्त उत्तरों से, उनके बारे में लोगों की प्रतिक्रिया मालूम की जाती है । दो अलग अलग विज्ञापनों के जो उत्तर मिलेंगे उन से यह मालूम हो जाएगा कि किसका कितना प्रभाव पड़ा है ।

इस तरीके से निदेशकों को उन लोगों का भी नाम मालूम होता है जो इस विषय में रुचि रखते हैं और इनको इस विषय का साहित्य भेजा जा सकता है ।

विदेशों में भारतीय वाणिज्य दूतावास

2939. **श्री ओंकार लाल बेरवा** : क्या वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि हाल ही में भारत ने विदेशों में अपने वाणिज्य दूतावासों की संख्या बढ़ा दी है ; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो इस समय उनकी संख्या कितनी है ?

वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री (श्री स्वर्ण सिंह) : (क) जी नहीं ।

(ख) इस समय 9 प्रधान कौंसलावास हैं, 8 कौंसलावास और 1 उप-कौंसलावास ।

Chinese claim on parts of Sikkim

2940. **Shri S. M. Banerjee:**
Shri Yashpal Singh:

Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Chinese have claimed part of Sikkim;

(b) if so, whether any protest has been lodged by Government; and

(c) if so, with what results?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) The Chinese Government have stated on numerous occasions that the Sikkim-Tibet boundary has been "formally delimited" and that "there is neither any discrepancy between the maps nor any disputes in practice". The Chinese have, however, maintained an aggressive posture on the Sikkim border.

(b) and (c). Government have protested repeatedly against the aggressive activities of Chinese troops on the Sikkim border.

Suspension of Defence Employees working in Kanpur

2941. **Shri S. M. Banerjee:**
Shri Bade:
Shri Hukam Chand Kachhavaiya:
Shri Sonavane:
Shri Y. D. Singh:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether some Defence employees were suspended in Kanpur on account of their participation in the All India token strike on the 12th, July, 1966;

(b) if so, whether suspension has been removed; and

(c) whether two apprentices, whose services were terminated, have been taken back?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) and (b). The requisite information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.

(c) Does not arise as there has been no instance of termination of services of any apprentices at Kanpur on account of their having participated in the strike on 12th July, 1966. However, on 27th July, 1966 two trade apprentices were placed under suspension for reasons unconnected with the strike. They have been charge-sheeted and their cases are under enquiry.

Radio sets for Orissa

2942. **Shri Dhuleshwar Meena:**
Shri Ramachandra Ulaka:

Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of radio sets allotted

in the rural areas of Orissa as on the 31st July, 1966;

(b) the number of radio sets actually working; and

(c) the number lying idle at present in that State?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) to (c). The information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.

Defence Production

2943. Shri D. C. Sharma: Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government have taken some steps to streamline the defence production so as to accord it a priority on emergent footing; and

(b) if so, the details of the measures taken and the success achieved?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) and (b). A number of steps to achieve greater defence production capability in an emergency have been taken by Government. Some of these are:—

(i) Technical discussions have been held with prospective suppliers for establishing production of critical defence materials, such as special steels and hard aluminium alloys. In regard to the special steels, responsibility has been allocated to the different production units. Educational orders have been placed in regard to the production of hard aluminium alloys.

(ii) An assessment of defence requirements of imported items has been carried out and recommendations for the reorientation of the Fourth Five Year Plan have been made to support Defence production. It has been proposed that some of the industrial undertakings in the civil sector should produce Defence requirements which are akin to their own lines of production.

(iii) Powers have also been delegated to Technical Committees under the Department of Defence Supplies to place development orders upto certain monetary limits.

(iv) Liaison has been established with National Laboratories for indigenous production of some of the imported Defence Items and specific projects have been assigned to these Laboratories.

It is too early to make a precise assessment of the effects of these measures. It is, however, expected that progressively our dependence on external sources for Defence equipment would be reduced and in many cases eliminated.

Bharat Earth Movers Factory in Mysore

2944. Shri H. C. Linga Reddy: Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) the latest progress made in locating the Bharat Earth Movers Factory in Kolar District, Mysore State;

(b) the amount so far spent and reasons for the slow pace of progress;

(c) the number of persons likely to be employed in the venture; and

(d) when the factory is likely to go into production?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) The civil works relating to the Crawler Tractor portion of the Bharat

Earth Movers Project at Kolar have been taken up and satisfactoy progress has been made.

(b) The actual expenditure on capital works of the first phase of Crawler Tractor Project incurred so far is of the order of Rs. 50 lakhs. It is expected that works involving a further expenditure of about Rs. 200 lakhs would be completed during the year 1966-67.

(c) The combined project for the manufacture of Heavy Earthmoving equipment as well as Crawler Tractors at the Kolar Factory when fully established is expected to provide direct employment to about 6,000 persons.

(d) The initial phase of assembly of Crawler Tractors is expected to start at Kolar by about October, 1966. Regular production of Crawler Tractors according to the phased manufacturing programme is likely to start in 1968-69. The Earthmoving portion of the project has not yet been cleared from the foreign exchange angle.

भारत-सोवियत संघ की संयुक्त विज्ञप्ति में जर्मनी का उल्लेख

2945. **श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री :**
श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :
डा० लक्ष्मीमल्ल सिंघवी :
श्री काशीराम गुप्त :
श्री मोहन स्वरूप :
श्री नारायण दांडेकर :
डा० मा० श्री० अणे :
श्री मधु लिमये :
श्री सोलंकी :
श्री रामसेवक यादव :
श्री किशन पटनायक :
श्री गौरी शंकर कक्कड़ :
श्री माते :
श्री श्रीनारायण दास :

क्या वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि प्रधान मंत्री की हाल की मास्को यात्रा के बाद जारी की गई संयुक्त विज्ञप्ति में जर्मनी के बारे में कोई उल्लेख था ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो क्या जर्मनी के बारे में सरकार की नीति में कोई परिवर्तन हुआ है ;

(ग) क्या सरकार को पश्चिमी जर्मनी से कोई पत्र मिला है जिसमें उसने इस बारे में अपनी प्रतिक्रिया व्यक्त की है ; और

(घ) यदि हां, तो उसका क्या उत्तर भेजा गया है ?

वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री (श्री स्वर्ण सिंह) : (क) जी, हां ।

(ख) जी, नहीं ।

(ग) जी, हां ।

(घ) हमने जर्मन संघीय गणराज्य को अपने यह विचार बता दिए हैं कि जर्मनी के बारे में भारत सरकार की नीति में कोई परिवर्तन नहीं हुआ है ।

प्रतिरक्षा कर्मचारियों द्वारा प्रदर्शन

2946. **श्री बड़े :**
श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय :
श्री युद्धवीर सिंह :
श्री ओंकार सिंह :

क्या रक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि 22 जुलाई, 1966 को सेना मुख्यालय के लगभग दस हजार असैनिक कर्मचारियों ने स्थल सेनाध्यक्ष के निवास स्थान के सामने प्रदर्शन किया था ;

(ख) यदि हां, तो इस प्रदर्शन के क्या कारण थे ; और

(ग) सरकार ने इस सम्बन्ध में क्या कार्यवाही की है ?

प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री (श्री यशवन्तराव चह्वाण) : (क) 22 जुलाई, 1966 को सेनाध्यक्ष के वास-स्थान के सामने सशस्त्र सेनाओं के मुख्यालयों के 1000 से 1500 असैनिक कर्मचारियों ने प्रदर्शन किया था।

(ख) प्रदर्शन था सेना मुख्यालयों की अधिकृत एस्टेब्लिशमेंट में बचत के तौर पर 10 प्रतिशत कटौती के विरुद्ध, जहां तक उसका प्रभाव असैनिक कर्मचारियों पर पड़ा।

(ग) 10 प्रतिशत कटौती में किसी असैनिक कर्मचारी की छटनी अन्तर्ग्रस्त नहीं है। तदपि, इससे अभिप्रेत है, उच्चतर ग्रेडों में कार्यवाहक के तौर पर काम कर रहे, असैनिक कर्मचारियों की कुछ संख्या की, अपने स्थायी ग्रेडों में पदावनति। ऐसी पदावनतियों के लिये आदेश जारी न करने का फैसला किया गया है, और वही बचत करने के लिए प्रतिकर उपायों का भी, जैसे कि निम्नतर ग्रेड में रिक्त स्थानों को अपूर्ण रखना।

Mig Factory at Ozar

2947. Shri Kishen Pattnayak:
Shri Madhu Limaye:
Shri Hukam Chand Kachhavaiya:
Shri Bade:
Shri Yudhvir Singh:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a dispute has arisen between the management of MIG Factory at Ozar, Nasik and the Union of MIG Fallorg employees;

(b) if so, the main points at dispute; and

(c) whether any effort is being made by the Defence Department to mediate in the dispute so as to prevent disruption of the production programme of this vital defence project?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): (a) and (b). No, Sir. It is not a fact that a serious dispute has arisen. The fact is that a demand has been made by the Union of the MIG employees for revision of the pay scales.

(c) The question of revision of pay scales of the Industrial employees in the Engineering Industries is under the consideration of the Wage Board. The revision of pay scales will depend upon the recommendations of the Wage Board as accepted by the Gevernmnt.

Ozar High School

2948. Shri Kishen Pattnayak:
Shri Madhu Limaye:
Shri Hukam Chand Kachhavaiya:
Shri Yudhvir Singh:
Shri Bade:

Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware that the Government of Maharashtra have agreed to transform the Ozar (Nasik) High School into a technical bias school and to bear 60 per cent of its cost;

(b) whether Government are also aware that the School, which is within the jurisdiction of the MIG factory rehabilitation programme, is not in a position to bear the remaining 40 percent cost;

(c) whether Government have been requested to pay this 40 per cent or a substantial portion of it to the School under the rehabilitation scheme; and

(d) if so, the reaction of Government thereto?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas):
(a) No, Sir.
(b) Does not arise.
(c) No, Sir.
(d) Does not arise.

Pak Protest about Propaganda Against Pakistani Judge of the World Court

2949. Shri Hem Barua: Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Pakistan High Commission in Delhi lodged a protest with Government alleging "malicious propaganda" by the All-India Radio as also by a section of the Indian press against the "Pakistani Judge at the International Court of Justice" over the World Court verdict on the S.W. Africa case; and

(b) if so, the actual position as also the grounds on which Pakistan has lodged her complaint with Government?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The grounds of the Pakistan High Commission complaint were that the All India Radio news commentary and the Indian press in giving currency to an Indian news agency despatch on the subject, had misrepresented the position of Sir Zafrulla Khan concerning his non-participation in the Judgement of the International Court in the S. W. Africa case.

The position is that in a press interparticipated in the judgement of the (Karachi) Dawn of 3rd August, 966, Sir Zafrulla Khan said "there were no grounds for dis-qualifying me. The President of the Court was of the view that it would be improper for me to sit, as I had at one time been nominated Judge Ad hoc by the Applicant States (Liberia and Ethiopia), though I never sat in that capacity. I disagreed entirely with that view and gave the President my reasons, which I still consider were good reasons. But he told me that a large majority of the Judges agreed with him that I should not sit. So, I had no option".

The report of the press interview in the Dawn of August 3rd, 1966, adds, however, that Sir Zafrulla Khan did not know who were the large majority of Judges supporting the President's views.

It is reliably understood that similar advice not to participate was given by the President of the International Court to another Judge. That other Judge availed of his statutory rights and insisted that the question of his non-participation be settled by formal decision of the Court. The upshot was that this other Judge participated in the judgment of the International Court in the S.W. Africa case. It is apparent that Sir Zafrulla Khan did not similarly exercise his statutory rights to have the matter of non-participation settled by formal decision of the Court.

राजस्थान में सीमावर्ती क्षेत्रों के लिये रेडियो सैटों का दिया जाना

2950. श्री प० ला० बारूपाल :
श्री धुलेश्वर मीना :

क्या सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि उनके मंत्रालय ने यह घोषणा की है कि वे सीमावर्ती क्षेत्रों में प्रत्येक ग्राम में ग्राम पंचायतों के माध्यम से एक एक रेडियो देंगे; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो राजस्थान के गंगानगर, बीकानेर, बाड़मेर तथा जैसलमेर जिलों में कितने गांवों में इस घोषणा के अनुसार रेडियो दिये जायेंगे तथा कब तक रेडियो दिये जाने की सम्भावना है ?

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री (श्री राज बहादुर) : (क) जी, नहीं । इस प्रकार की कोई घोषणा नहीं की गई है, परन्तु हमारा लक्ष्य है कि जितनी जल्दी हो सके देश के प्रत्येक गांव में एक एक रेडियो सेट लगा दिया जाए बशर्ते इसके लिए धन और विदेशी मुद्रा

उपलब्ध हो और राज्यों में, इन सेटों की देख रेख का प्रबन्ध हो ।

(ख) सवाल नहीं उठता ।

पाकिस्तान द्वारा युद्ध-विराम रेखा का उल्लंघन

2951. **श्री प० ला० बारूपाल :**
श्री धुलेश्वर मीना :

क्या रक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या युद्ध-विराम के बाद भी पाकिस्तानी सेना ने हमारे देश की सीमा का अनेक बार उल्लंघन किया है जिससे हमारे देश की जनता में बड़ा भय उत्पन्न हो गया है; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो इस बारे में सरकार द्वारा क्या कार्यवाही की जा रही है ?

प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री (श्री यशवन्तराव चह्वाण): (क) तथा (ख). युद्ध-विराम और ताशकन्द करार होते हुए भी अपनी सीमाओं और युद्ध-विराम रेखा के साथ-साथ पाकिस्तान द्वारा अस्थायी अतिक्रमण और उल्लंघन की कई घटनायें हुई हैं। स्वाभाविक तौर पर सरकार और भारत के नागरिकों के लिए यह बात चिन्ता का कारण बनी रही है। यद्यपि सीमा और युद्ध-विराम रेखा के इन अतिक्रमणों को सम्पूर्णतः समाप्त कर पाना संभव न हो पाए, सरकार ने देश की क्षेत्रीय एकता सुनिश्चित करने का उपाय करते हुए, उसके लिए दृढ़ संकल्प लिया है और ऐसे कामों की प्रवृत्ति से पाकिस्तान को लाभ न उठाने देने का भी ।

राजस्थान में भूतपूर्व सैनिकों के लिये कृषि भूमि

2952. **श्री प० ला० बारूपाल :**
श्री धुलेश्वर मीना :

क्या रक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) राजस्थान में कितने भूतपूर्व सैनिकों को जीवन निर्वाह के साधन के तौर पर कृषि-भूमि दी गई है और कितने सैनिकों के आवेदन पत्र अभी तक विचाराधीन हैं ; और

(ख) उन की कब तक भूमि दिये जाने की सम्भावना है ?

प्रतिरक्षा मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री अ० म० थामस) : (क) और (ख). पूछी गई सूचना राजस्थान सरकार से इकट्ठी की जा रही है और जब प्राप्त हुई सभा के पटल पर रख दी जाएगी ।

नई समाचार एजेंसी

2953. **श्री रामसेवक यादव :**
श्री सुरेन्द्रनाथ द्विवेदी :
श्री हेम बरुआ :
श्री हरि विष्णु कामत :

क्या सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या अखिल भारतीय समाचारपत्र सम्पादक सम्मेलन ने केन्द्रीय और राज्य सरकारों द्वारा एक नई समाचार एजेन्सी को पूंजी और ऋण के रूप में काफी सहायता देकर समाचारपत्रों की स्वतन्त्रता की अवहेलना करने के प्रयत्न का जोरदार विरोध किया है ; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो इस बारे में सरकार की क्या प्रतिक्रिया है ?

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री (श्री राज बहादुर) : (क) शायद प्रश्न "समाचार भारती" के बारे में है, जिसको सरकार ने 5 लाख रुपये का ऋण देना मंजूर किया है। सरकार को अखिल भारतीय समाचार-पत्र सम्पादक सम्मेलन से ऐसा कोई ज्ञापन नहीं मिला है, जिसमें प्रस्तावित ऋण देने का विरोध किया गया हो। सरकार को इसकी कोई सूचना नहीं है कि अखिल भारतीय

समाचार-पत्र सम्पादक सम्मेलन ने, राज्य सरकारों से उनके द्वारा इस समाचार एजेन्सी को सहायता देने का, विरोध किया है । चाहे भी हो यह बात राज्य सरकारों से सम्बन्धित है ।

(ख) प्रश्न नहीं उठता ।

A.I.R. Stations in Mysore State

2954. Shri H. C. Linga Reddy: Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state:

(a) the further progress made in the matter of locating A.I.R. Stations at Mysore, Hubli, Dharwar and Gulbarga in Mysore State;

(b) the amount spent in these Stations; and

(c) when the same will be completed?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): (a) Auxiliary Centre at Gulbarga is expected to be commissioned into service during the current financial year. Dharwar has already a station which covers Hubli. There is no other approved scheme for the present for Mysore.

(b) and (c). The project of medium power medium wave transmitter and receiving centre at Dharwar completed during the 3rd Plan cost approximately Rs. 7.8 lakhs. The Auxiliary Centre being installed at Gulbarga is estimated to cost Rs. 10·77 lakhs.

श्रीलंका के बैंकों में श्रीलंका निवासी भारतीयों का जमा धन

2955. **श्री मुहम्मद कोया** : क्या वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या श्रीलंका निवासी उन भारतीयों को, जिनका रुपया श्रीलंका के बैंकों में रोक लिया गया है, अपना रुपया भारत में लाने के मामले में श्रीलंका सरकार के साथ हाल में बातचीत की गई है ; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो इस बारे में श्रीलंका की प्रतिक्रिया क्या है ?

वैदेशिक-कार्य मंत्री (श्री स्वर्ण सिंह) : (क) और (ख). भारत सरकार को यह जानकारी नहीं है कि श्रीलंका में रहने वाले भारतीयों के बैंक खातों पर रोक लगा दी गई है । जो लोग श्रीलंका के निवासी नहीं हैं, उनके बैंक खाते खोलने पर प्रतिबन्ध है । ये प्रतिबन्ध उन सभी राष्ट्रों पर लागू होते हैं जो श्रीलंकावासी नहीं हैं और वे भारतीयों के प्रति भेदभावपूर्ण नहीं हैं । इसलिए, भारत सरकार ने श्रीलंका की सरकार से सामान्य तौर पर कोई शिकायत नहीं की है । लेकिन, भारतीय हाई कमीशन अलग-अलग मामलों पर, उनके महत्व के अनुरूप, सम्बद्ध अधिकारियों के साथ लिखा-पढ़ी करता है ।

Alleged Nuclear Explosion by India

2956. Shri D. C. Sharma: Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether a report has been published in a Canadian newspaper that India will explode a nuclear device within 30 days; and

(b) if so, whether the matter has been taken with the Canadian Government and with what result?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) An article appeared in the Canadian newspaper 'The Globe and Mail' on the 29th July 1966 regarding a reported statement by the Pakistan Foreign Ministry to the Canadian High Commission in Rawalpindi about alleged plans by India to explode a nuclear device in which it was stated that "one version of the Pakistan report to Canada is that it anticipated an Indian atomic explosion within 30 days."

(b) The question of the matter being taken up with the Canadian Government in specific terms did not arise as a spokesman of the Canadian Government stated that they have no evidence to suggest that India is planning a nuclear explosion, peaceful or otherwise, and that any story regarding India's plan for a nuclear explosion must be regarded as hypothetical and speculative.

Kalpakkam Power Plant

2957. **Dr. P. Srinivasan:**
Shri M. Malaichami:
Shri M. P. Swamy:
Shri Muthiah:

Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) whether negotiations with France for a loan to set up Kalpakkam Power Plant have been concluded;

(b) if so, the terms and details thereof; and

(c) the estimated power generation thereof?

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): (a) and (b). It has not been possible to secure the agreement of the Government of France to extend a loan to cover the foreign exchange component of the cost of the Madras Atomic Power Station.

(c) The Station is intended to generate 400 MW of electrical power.

एमर्जेंसी कमीशन प्राप्त अफसरों की छंटनी

2958. **श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री :**
श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती :
श्री स० मो० बनर्जी :

क्या रक्षा मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि एमर्जेंसी कमीशन में भर्ती किये गये अफसरों में से कुछ व्यक्तियों की छंटनी की जा रही है ;

(ख) क्या यह भी सच है कि उन में से कुछ अफसरों ने हाल के भारत-पाक संघर्ष में बहुत बढ़िया कार्य किया था ;

(ग) यदि हां, तो वर्तमान परिस्थितियों में उन सब की छंटनी करने का क्या औचित्य है ; और

(घ) श्रेणी वार, कितने अफसरों की छंटनी की जा रही है ?

प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री (श्री यशवन्तराव चह्वाण): (क) अर्ह आपाती कमीशन प्राप्त अफसरों को स्थायी कमीशन के लिए आवेदन देने की अनुमति दी गई है, जिसके लिये आपाती कमीशन प्राप्त अफसरों की कुल संख्या शक्ति का अधिकाधिक एक तिहाई कोटा नियत किया गया है और इस उद्देश्य के लिए उनका सर्विसिज सिलेक्शन बोर्डों द्वारा इण्टर्व्यु किया जा रहा है। जिन्हें अनर्हता अथवा न चुने जाने के कारण स्थायी कमीशनें नहीं दी जातीं, उन्हें 1967–70 की अवधि के दौरान प्रावस्थित कार्यक्रम के अनुसार सेवा से विमुक्त किया जाएगा ।

तदपि, जहां तक चिकित्सा शाखाओं और रिमाऊंट तथा वेटेरिनरी कोर का सम्बन्ध है, इस समय आपाती कमीशन प्राप्त अफसरों को विमुक्त करने का कोई कार्यक्रम नहीं है ।

(ख) तथा (ग). जब तक सर्विसिज सिलेक्शन बोर्डों द्वारा इण्टर्व्यु के अन्तिम परिणाम प्राप्य नहीं होते, इस समय यह कहना कठिन है, कि आया जिन अफसरों ने हाल में के भारत पाक युद्ध में अच्छा काम किया है, वह भी उनमें होंगे, जो विमुक्त किए जा रहे हैं । उन अफसरों के लिए स्थायी कमीशन पाने के लिए चुने जाने और सेना में रख लिये जाने के लिए खासा अवसर प्राप्त होगा, जिन्होंने अच्छा काम किया है ।

आपाती कमीशनें 1963–65 की अवधि के दौरान आपात स्थितिकाल के लिए और उसके पश्चात् उस समय तक के लिए प्रदान

की गई थीं कि जब तक उनकी सेवाओं की आवश्यकता रहे, और अन्य बातों के साथ ऐसा स्पष्ट कर दिया गया था कि किसी भी अफसर की कमीशन किसी समय भी भारत सरकार द्वारा समाप्त की जा सकती है, अगर उसकी सेवाओं की और आवश्यकता न रहे । सभी कमीशन प्राप्त अफसरों को सेना को सेवा में स्थायी तौर पर रख पाना संभव नहीं है । सावधान विचार करने के पश्चात् ही, आपाती कमीशन प्राप्त अफसरों में से दो तिहाई को एक प्रावस्थित कार्यक्रम के अनुसार विमुक्त करने का निर्णय किया गया था । मुख्य कारण हैं :—

(1) उन सभी को रखने से अफसर काडर में आयु और सेवा ढांचे में असंतुलन पैदा हो जाएगा, और प्रशासनिक समस्यायें खड़ी हो जाएंगी, और

(2) सभी समयों में, अल्पकाल के लिए सक्रिय सेवा और उसके पश्चात् और अधिक अवधि के लिये रिजर्व देयता सहित निम्न पदों में सेना में अल्पकालीन कमीशन प्राप्त जवान अफसरों का कुछ अंश रखना आवश्यक है कि जिन्हें साल बसाल पर्याप्त संख्या में भर्ती कर पाना संभव नहीं होगा, अगर सभी आपाती कमीशन प्राप्त अफसर सेवा में रख लिए जायें।

ऐसे उपाय किए जा रहे हैं/किए जाएंगे कि यथासंभव जितने अधिक हो सकें, सेवा से विमुक्त किये गये आपाती कमीशन प्राप्त अफसर असैनिक रोजगार में पुनरावासित किए जा सकें ।

(घ) आवश्यक सूचना सर्विसिज सिलेक्शन बोर्डों द्वारा की जा रही इण्टर्व्यूओं के सम्पूर्ण परिणामों के पता चलने के पश्चात् ही केवल प्राप्य होगी ।

United Nations Organisation for Industrial Development

2959. Shri Shree Narayan Das: Will the Minister of **External Affairs** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any, if so, what progress has been made in the direction of establishing United Nations Organisation for Industrial Development;

(b) whether procedure and administrative arrangements of this organisation have been finalised; and

(c) if so, the main features so far decided?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): (a) and (b). The U.N. General Assembly, at its 20th Session, decided *vide* resolution 2089(XX) of 20th December, 1965 to establish a United Nations Organisation for Industrial Development as an autonomous organisation within the United Nations. By the same resolution, the General Assembly sea up an *Ad Hoc* Committee to prepare the necessary operating procedures and administrative arrangements of the new Organisation. The Ad Hoc Committee has submitted a report which contains its recommendations. These recommendations will be considered by the General Assembly at its 21st Session commencing on September 20, 1966, when the necessary arrangements are expected to be finalised.

(c) A copy of the draft resolution prepared by the *Ad Hoc* Committee for adoption by the General Assembly, which contains the recommendations of the Committee on the procedures and administrative arrangements of the Organisation is laid on the Table of the House. [*Placed in Library. See* No. LT-6842/66].

Sainik School in Pachmarhi

2960. Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Will the Minister of **Defence** be pleased to state:

(a) whether there has been any further progress in the matter of

establishing a Sainik School in Pachmarhi, Madhya Pradesh;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) if not, the reasons therefor?

The Minister of Defence (Shri Y. B. Chavan): (a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) There is already a Sainik School at Rewa in Madhya Pradesh, which has to 285 boys at present though the scheme privides for an intake of 525. It would be desirable to develop further the Rewa school to its full capacity before taking up a fresh venture.

12.03 hrs.

CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 5666, DATED 16-5-66 RE. BOND FOR SERVICE OFFICERS

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): In part (a) of Unstarred Question No. 5666 tabled for answer on the 16th May, 1966, the following information was desired:

> "Whether Government takes any bond in writing from the Service Officers regarding their services;"

The reply then given by me was as follows:—

> "No, Sir, except in non-technical branches of the Air Force, where a candidate selected for a commission is required to sign a covenant under which he is liable to serve for a minimum period of eight years including the period of cadetship....."

While giving the abovementioned reply, inadvertently it was not also stated that before accepting Regular Commissions in the Remount and Veterinary Corps, officers are required to sign a bond undertaking to serve for at least 5 years from the date of Regular Commission, failing which they should refund to the Government the cost of training.

I am taking this opportunity to correct the reply previously given.

12.04 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

REPORTED COMPLAINT OF THE CHIEF MINISTER J. & K STATE AGAINST CENTRAL GOVERNMENT.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): I call the attention of the Minister of Home Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon:

> "The news item in the *Hindustan Times* dated 20th August 1966, about the Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir complaining against the Central Government for creating uncertaintes in Jammu and Kashmir and not consulting him in vital matters."

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Nanda): I will be prepared to make a statement in the course of the day, in the afternoon, if it suits you.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister says he will make a statement later in the day.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: At what time so that I may be here then?

Mr. Speaker: As soon as today's first item of discussion is finished.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): That will encroach upon the time for that motion. It is an important issue. Let it be taken up tomorrow.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I do not mind.

Mr. Speaker: As soon as the debate on that motion is finished, we will ask him to make his statement.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I would only submit that I had addressed this notice to the Prime Minister. I do not mind the Home Minister answering it, but I would appreciate it if the hon. Prime Minister is present when this is answered.

12.05 hrs.

Re: CALLING ATTENTION NOTICES (Query)

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : (बिजनौर) : अध्यक्ष जी, मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि इसी विषय का ध्यान आकर्षण प्रस्ताव जब मैंने दिया कि प्रधान मंत्री ने श्री जय प्रकाश नारायण को शेखअब्दुल्ला से मिलने की अनुमति किस आधार पर दी, तो आपने नामंजूर कर दिया और वही चीज जब सादिक साहब का नाम आ गया, तो आज आपने एलाऊ कर दिया ....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह तो दोनों में बड़ा फर्क है। मैं समझता हूं कि यह तो आप न कहें कि यही चीज मैंने भी दिया। दोनों में बड़ा फर्क है।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (देवास) : मैंने भी एक नोटिस दिया था।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब इस वक्त और कोई नोटिस नहीं लिया जायेगा। क्वेश्चन आफ प्रिविलिज बाई मिस्टर मधु लिमये।.. (**व्यवधान**).. अगर आप का नाम होगा, तो बाद में देख लेंगे।

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : ऐसे तो छः सात पड़े हुए हैं, किस मामले के बारे में आप कह रहे हैं?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह अगर मिस्टर राम सेवक यादव यहां हों, तो वह कहेंगे।

श्री मधु लिमये : वह डाक्टर साहब रखेंगे।

Mr. Speaker: Dr. Lohia, about this Minister of Education allegedly Misleading the House, regarding the figures of the area of India.

श्री क० ना० तिवारी (बगहा) : प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर सर, यह विशेषाधिकार प्रस्ताव जो है यह रोज का नियम हो गया है। पहले नियम यह था कि आप अपने चेम्बर में बुला करके बात कर लेते थे और शायद यही प्रेक्टिस यू० के० पार्लियामेंट का भी है। कोई ऐसी बात जिसके बारे में डेसीशन स्पीकर नहीं लेते हैं, वही सवाल यहां आता है हाउस में। लेकिन अब आये दिन रोज यही बात हो गई है कि जितने विशेषाधिकार प्रस्ताव हैं उनके बारे में आप वहां डेसीशन न लेकर के सब यहीं लेते हैं.....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने सारे तो यहां नहीं लिए हैं। बकाया जितने आने थे वह कोई मैंने नहीं लिये। मैंने प्रिविलेज का सवाल लिया है।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने ऐडजर्नमेंट मोशन दिये हैं.... (**व्यवधान**)

श्री त्यागी (देहरादून) : मुझे भी एक अर्ज करनी है। (**व्यवधान**)

Mr. Speaker: Not in this manner. All will kindly resume their seats. Every member might kindly resume his seat, Shri Bhattacharya.

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya (Serampore): I do not understand the procedure that you are following. Some times we give calling attention notices on matters of very great public importance and urgency, but they are not admitted. Today thousands of teachers are demonstrating here and I gave a calling notice, I do not know why you are rejecting it. So, you kindly tell us which is public importance.

Mr. Speaker: I am not to advice. I am only to decide. He will kindly resume his seat.

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya: You kindly tell me which is a fit case. That is what I request.

Mr. Speaker: When I stand up, he stands up, when I sit down, he also sits down.

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya: My point is very simple. I want a definition from you in which circums-

[Shri Dinen Bhattacharya]

tances you will admit our motion. The teachers are demonstrating ***.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He cannot raise it in this manner. It will not go on record.

श्री क० ना० तिवारी : मैंने जो कहा उसके बारे में क्या हुआ ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने कहा कि मैंने बन्द कर दिया है, मैंने सब यहां नहीं लिया है।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने दो ऐडजर्नमेंट मोशन दिये हैं ...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : ऐडजर्नमेंट मोशन मैंने नामंजूर कर दिया...(**व्यवधान**)..अब हर एक मेम्बर अपने लिए खुद फैसला नहीं करेगा कि क्योंकि वह ऐडजर्नमेंट मोशन या कालिंग अटेंशन नोटिस को इतना जरूरी समझता है, इसलिए उसको लिया जाय।..

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय अध्यक्ष महोदय, वह इतना महत्वपूर्ण है ...(**व्यवधान**)..गोली चला रहे है भारतीयों पर.....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं बन्द कर रहा हूं और फिर वह बोले चले जा रहे हैं। मैंने कछवाय साहब, आप को उस दिन भी मना किया...(**व्यवधान**)

श्री ओंकार लाल बेरवा (कोटा) : राजस्थान में दस घुसपैठिये आ गए ..(**व्यवधान**)

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : ***

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बन्द कर दिया जाय यह न लिखा जाय। मैंने तीन चार दफा बन्द किया है और कछवाय साहब बन्द नहीं होते।

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): He had your permission.

Mr. Speaker: No, I am not giving permission at this time to raise it. There is some limit to my patience also.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Kindly hear me.

Mr. Speaker: I have not to again and again outline what conditions govern or determine the admissibility of a calling attention notice. The Members have been here and they know them. I am not to advise, I am here only to take decisions when questions come up, and I will not allow these questions to be raised, because it is physically impossible that I should discuss here 40 notices, that one after another Members should stand up and each refer to his own notice saying it is very important. Of course, it might be important so far as he is concerned, but it may not be so important.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: It is an all-India demonstration.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : डिमांस्ट्रेशन के लिए तो मैं कहता हूं कि यह डिमांस्ट्रेशनस और स्ट्राइक्स को मैं आडिनरिली ऐडमिट नहीं करूंगा जब तक कि कोई खास बात नहीं देखूंगा। बाहर डिमांस्ट्रेशन हो और यहां आकर कालिंग अटेंशन नोटिस या ऐडजर्नमेंट मोशन दिया जाय, यह इस तरह नहीं हो सकता।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : जब हंगामा होगा तब देखेंगे।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: May I ask your permission to seek a clarification?

Mr. Speaker: No, Sir, not know.

12.10 hrs.

RE QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE AGAINST THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION

डा० राममनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा विशेषाधिकार प्रस्ताव माननीय शिक्षामंत्री के खिलाफ है भारत के

*Not recorded.

क्षेत्रफल को लेकर । मुझे सिर्फ इतना ही नहीं साबित करना है कि उन्होंने गलत-बयानी की है, मुझे साबित करना है कि उन्होंने जान-बूझकर सच को छुपाया है अथवा जान-बूझकर असत्य बोला है और इस तरह सदन को गुमराह किया है। जो मामला है वह करीब 85 लाख एकड़ जमीन भारत सरकार की अपनी खुद की किताबों के हिसाब से है और पांच करोड़ एकड़ जमीन संयुक्त राष्ट्र की किताबों के हिसाब से जो भारत ने खोई है।

अब मैं माननीय शिक्षा मंत्री के बयान से जो उन्होंने 12-9-66 को दिया था, एक वाक्य पढ़कर सुनाता हूं। आपके पास, अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बयान है?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप पढ़िये, मैं सुन रहा हूं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : क्योंकि उससे मामले को तय करने में सुभीता होगा कि कितनी हद तक सत्य को छुपाया है या असत्य बोला है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप जितना बीफ़ली कह सकें, कहें।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : यह प्रश्न अध्यक्ष महोदय, ऐसा है, जिसमें आप मुझे थोड़ी सी इजाजत दीजिये। मैं एक वाक्य पढ़ कर सुनाता हूं —

1961 में केन्द्रीय अंक संगठन अनुरोध पर यू० ए० डेमोग्राफिक ईयर बुक के लिये संयुक्त राष्ट्र अंक दफ्तर को क्षेत्रफल के आंकड़े भेजता रहा है। संयुक्त राष्ट्र द्वारा दिये गये 1961 से आगे के भारत के क्षेत्रफल के आंकड़े लगभग सी०एस०ओ० के आंकड़ों के समान हैं, केवल जम्मू और काश्मीर के क्षेत्रफल को भारत के क्षेत्रफल से जबरदस्ती अलग रखा गया है। यहां मंत्री जी ने कहा है कि जो कुछ इन्होंने भेजा है संयुक्त राष्ट्र को, उनको उन्होंने छापा है, खाली जम्मू काश्मीर के अंक निकाल दिये गये हैं।

मैं इसी की तुलना में प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो इस सदन में 16 मई को जवाब दिया था, उसको पढ़ कर सुनाता हूं — एक अतारांकित प्रश्न सं० 5697 के जवाब में उन्होंने बताया कि 1961 में भारत सरकार और उसके अंक संगठन ने संयुक्त राष्ट्र को 29 लाख 49 हजार 275 वर्ग किलोमीटर का अंक भेजा था, जब कि 1964 में 32 लाख 76 हजार का अंक भेजा गया, तो इस प्रकार खुद भारत सरकार ने जो अंक भेजे, वे 1961 में करीब ढाई लाख वर्ग किलोमीटर कम थे।

माननीय शिक्षा मंत्री ने इस तथ्य को सदन में छुपाया है, क्यों कि उन्होंने कहा है कि खाली जम्मू-काश्मीर के अंक निकाले हैं और कुछ संयुक्त राष्ट्र ने नहीं किया है। लेकिन माननीय प्रधान मंत्री के अपने जवाब से यह जाहिर होता है कि ढाई लाख का अंक कम कर के 1961 में भेजा गया, उसका कारण क्या था? यह मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूं। लेकिन पहले यह साबित कर दूं कि शिक्षा मंत्री जी को इस बात का पता था, क्योंकि यह असली चीज है, वह गलत-बयानी कर सकते थे बिना जाने हुए, लेकिन यहां उन्होंने जानबूझ-कर यह सत्य छुपाया, क्योंकि 12-7-66 को उन्होंने अपने बयान में बताया कि 16 मई, 1966 के लोकसभा के अतारांकित प्रश्न के उत्तर में प्रधान मंत्री जी ने बताया था, यह बात उन्होंने खुद कही है, इस लिये प्रधान मंत्री जी के उत्तर का उनको पता था और पता होते हुए भी प्रधान मंत्री के 1964 के अंक तो उन्होंने बताये, लेकिन 1961 वाले अंकों को नहीं बताया: उसका कारण यह हुआ कि 1961 में साठवीं जनगणना हुई थी और तब भारत सरकार ने जो संयुक्त राष्ट्र को अंक भेजे वे अपूर्ण थे, कच्चे थे और जो हम लोगों को जवाब दिया, उस में लिखा भी है कि 1961 के आंकड़ों में उन क्षेत्रों के आंकड़े सम्मिलित नहीं हैं, जिन के बारे में रपट भेजते समय 1961 की जनगणना संबंधी आंकड़े उपलब्ध नहीं थे। तो वह कच्चे

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

थे, अधूरे थे, प्रधान मंत्री ने खुद इस बात को कहा है। अब यह बात कैसे हो गई कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र को इस तरह से अधूरे अंक भेज दिये गये थे? लापरवाही से या उस से भी ज्यादा खतरनाक कोई चीज थी, जासूसी थी या दोनों मिलाजुलाकार कुछ था? लेकिन हर हालत मे भारत सरकार ने संयुक्त राष्ट्र को भेजा, यह बात सिद्ध हो जाती है और सिर्फ इतना ही नहीं, शिक्षा मंत्री ने इस तथ्य को दबाया।

इसके अलावा मैं थोड़ा सा आपका ध्यान इस ओर भी खींचूं कि इन्होंने 9 पैरा के पहले वाक्य में यह बताया है कि संयुक्त राष्ट्र संघ ने क्षेत्रफल के आंकड़े सांख्यकी संघ से नहीं मांगे, उसके रजिस्ट्रार से नहीं मांगे और न उन्होंने उसके पहले कोई आंकड़े भेजे है, लेकिन यह नहीं बताया कि क्या भारत सरकार अथवा उसकी किसी संस्था ने 1961 से पहले संयुक्त राष्ट्र को कोई आंकड़े भेजे थे और ऐसे बयान में ईमानदारी के साथ बताना चाहिये था, न कि चालाकी के साथ, उन्होंने हम से मांगे या न मांगे, बल्कि यह कि हमारी सरकार या उसकी किसी संस्था ने संयुक्त राष्ट्र को ये अंक भेजे अथवा नहीं भेजे।

यह तो हुई संयुक्त राष्ट्र के अंकों की बात, अब मैं आपसे भारत सरकार की अपनी किताबों की बात करता हूं, भारत सर्वे की, और उसमे आप मेहरबानी करके 12-5-66 को शिक्षा मंत्री जी का जो बयान है, उस पर ध्यान दीजिये –

इण्डिया 1953 प्रकाशन में दिये गये 12 लाख 69 हजार 640 वर्ग मील का क्षेत्रफल कच्चे तखमीने पर आधारित था, इन आंकड़ों में सिक्कम का क्षेत्रफल भी शामिल था, जो बाद के कुछ प्रकाशनों में भारत के क्षेत्रफल में ही शामिल किया जाता रहा। मिसाल के तौर पर 1961 की जन-गणना प्रकाशन में, जैसे 1951 के पहले जन-गणना प्रकाशन में किया गया था, और अधिक सही सूचना मिलने पर क्षेत्रफल के आंकड़ों मे संशोधन कर दिया गया, माननीय शिक्षा मंत्री ने कहा कि 1953 का अंक मोटा तखमीना था। मैं जोर के साथ कहना चाहता हूं कि यह बिल्कुल असत्य है। सर्वे के अंक कभी भी मोटे तखमीने पर हो ही नही सकते और उसका सबसे बड़ा प्रमाण मैं आपको यह बताना चाहता हूं कि मैंने जब गोवा-दमन-दीव वगैरह के क्षेत्रफल को सर्वे के प्रकाशनों में देखा तो गोवा दमन-दीव का अंक आया – 3,733,07, एक किलोमीटर नहीं बल्कि एक किलोमीटर का चौदहवां हिस्सा, जब हमारा सर्वे इतनी गहराई तक काम करता है तो मोटे तखमीने की बात करना –यह बिल्कुल ही असत्य है। मैं खास तौर से आपका ध्यान इस ओर भी खींच देता हूं, कि यह 1953 में नहीं किया गया, यहां 1953 से लगाकर 1958 तक यही अंक दिया जाता रहा है –बढ़ा हुआ अंक 12 लाख ०9 हजार का और 1958 में यह अंक कुछ कम हुआ है। अगर इजाजत दें तो मैं आपको बताऊं कि 1953, 54, 55, 56, 57 सब में 12 लाख 69 हजार आया है, लेकिन 1958 में यकायक 12 लाख 59 हजार हो गया, जो कि 1962 तक चलता रहा और 1962 में एक हजार 600 बढ़ जाता है। मैं फिर से कह दूं कि यह खुद भारत सरकार की अपनी सर्वे की किताबों के अंक हैं।

अब सवाल यह उठता है आगे कि 53 से 57 तक पांच वर्ष तक जो अंक दिए गए हैं उनको 58 में कैसे घटा दिया गया! अब इस सम्बन्ध में मैं माननीय सदन को बतादूं कि यह केवल हिसाब किताब का मामला नहीं है कागजी नहीं है। ऐसा नहीं कि कोई चीज हमारे पास रहते हुए भी किताबों में सिर्फ खोई है। मुझे पूरा विश्वास है इन अंकों से कि बहुत सी जमीनें भारत की खोई जा चुकी हैं और बहुत सी खोई जाने वाली है। यह 53

से 58 तक जिस वक्त अंक घटाये गये उसकी कुछ सफ़ाई उसी सर्वे के कच्छ के आंकड़ों से मिलती है। कच्छ के आंकड़े 1956 तक 16724 किलोमीटर बतलाये गये हैं। फिर उसके बाद 57 से लगा कर 62 तक वह घट जाते हैं, 8300 हो जाते हैं। 16000 से 83001 8000 वर्ग किलोमीटर की कमी कच्छ के क्षेत्रफल में खुद भारत सरकार के अपने सर्वे से हो जाती है और फिर 1963 में जाकर वह बढ़ती है और 17000 वर्ग किलोमीटर जुड़ जाती है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय इस कच्छ वाले मामले को मैं इतना ही बतला दूं कि जब कभी किसी दुकान का दीवाला निकलने लगता है तो उस का बहीखाता हिसाब खराब हो जाता है और जब किसी देश की जमीनें मिटने वाली, घटने वाली या छिनने वाली होती हैं तो उसके दस्तावेज बिगड़ जाया करते हैं। अब पाकिस्तान की सरकार को और ज्यादा कुछ करने की जरूरत नहीं। खुद भारत सरकार को सर्वे के इन अंकों को न्याय संघ के सामने रख देने पर अपना पक्ष बिल्कुल मजबूत करने का मौका मिल जायेगा और मुझे पता चला है कि जो न्याय संघ है उसके सभापति ने सलाह दी है भारत सरकार को कि यह अच्छा होगा कच्छ आफ़ रन के मामले में आधे आधे में समझौता करलो। वैसे तो मैं आपको यहां पर अबब बतला देता कि किस तरीक़े से जो भारत पाक ने न्याय संघ में एक समझौता किया हुआ है उसका एक वाक्य बिलकुल भारत की पुरानी किताबों के वाक्य से मिलता जुलता है वह 24 लैटीच्यूड के बारे में लेकिन इस वक्त मैं उसे छोड़े देता हूं क्योंकि एक दूसरा मामला जो सर्वे से साबित होता है क्योंकि इनके हिसाब से करीब 10000 वर्ग किलोमीटर जमीन कम होती है जबकि वह हमारे हिसाब से 15-20 तक जाती है जिसमें 8000 कच्छ वाली होगी। लेकिन इसके अलावा भी जमीनें गई हैं लौंगजू में। लौंगजू के बारे में इस सदन को हमेशा बतलाया गया कि वह सिर्फ एक दो मील है लेकिन मुझे पता है कि लौंगजू घाटी सैकड़ों वर्गमील की हाथ से गई। यह जमीन गई का मतलब यह नहीं कि दुश्मनों ने या परदेसियों ने उसके ऊपर पक्टनी कब्जा जमा लिया जैसे अक्साई-चिन पर बल्कि यह कि उसके ऊपर जो भारत का कागजी अधिकार था कानूनी अधिकार था उसको भारत सरकार ने छोड़ दिया है। तो लौंगजू में सैकड़ों वर्गमील जमीन न सिर्फ पलटनी कब्जे से निकल गई है बल्कि कानूनी कब्जे से भी निकल गई है मतलब भारत ने उसको छोड़ दिया है।

इसके अलावा बाड़ाहोती जो बद्रीनाथ का उत्तरी मैदान है छोटा बाड़ाहोती और बड़ा बाड़ाहोती तो बड़े बाड़ाहोती की जमीनों को भी भारत सरकार ने छोड़ दिया है। इसी तरीक़े से तिब्बत में एक गांव मंसर था जिसकी कि जमीन सन् 1951 की गणना तक भारत में शामिल की जाती थी वह जमीन भी घट गई है और उसी के साथ साथ बरमा को भी कई हजार वर्गमील जमीन चली गई है। यह सब मिलाकर वास्तव में हमारी जमीनें गई हैं खाली इतना नहीं हुआ है। आप मुझे अगर दो तीन मिनट देगें .....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं इसके पहले भी घंटी बजा चुका हूं। यह देखिये मैं इसको कंसेंट अपने चैम्बर में जब देकर आया तो महज इस गरज से देकर आया था कि मुख्तसर में मैं 2, 4 मिनट में आपको सुनने के बाद इस पर फैसला दे दूंगा कि आया वह इन आर्डर है या नहीं और आपको वाजिब था कि मुख्तसर में कह कर खत्म कर देते ताकि इस मामले में एक या दूसरी तरफ़ फैसला करने में मुझे हैल्प हो सके। लेकिन अगर आप एक एक तफ़सील को इस तरह से इस वक्त लेगें तो मेरे लिए बहुत मुश्किल होगी। एक घंटा हमइस पर खर्च नहीं कर सकते हैं कि कंसेंट दी जावे या नहीं। अलबत्ता अगर बाद में यह सवाल

[अध्यक्ष महोदय]

उठा तो फिर आप तफ़सील में जा सकते हैं। मैं आपसे कहूंगा कि आप ख़त्म करें।

श्री त्यागी (देहरादून) : सर औन ए प्वाएंट ऑफ़ आर्डर। पुराना रिवाज और पार्लियामेंट का रिवाज यह है कि जब इस क़िस्म का कोई प्वाएंट आता है तो स्पीकर बजाय इस के कि उनसे सलाह ले कि यह कायदे में है या नहीं और इतनी देर तक मैरिट्स पर बातचीत हो जो कि रोज़ाना हो रही है और हमारा वक्त ख़राब होता है इसलिए मैं आपसे दरख्वास्त करता हूं कि आप उसको पढ़ने के बाद एक साफ़ फैसला कीजिये कि यह आर्डर में है या नहीं। आपको स्पीकर इसलिए नहीं बनाया गया है कि आप मेजारिटी की राय के मताबिक ही फैसला दें। आप इस पर जो भी रूलिंग देंगे वह हम सबको स्वीकार्य होगी हम सब उसके सामने सिर झुका लेंगे। लेकिन उसकी मैरिट्स पर इतना लम्बा डिस्कशन होना और उसको कराने के बाद जो आप फैसला करना चाहते हैं तो यह रिवाज आयन्दा से बंद होना चाहिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : दुरुस्त है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अब सिर्फ मैं एक जान बूझकर गलत बयानी बतलाये देता हूं जो माननीय मंत्री के पैरे 3 में है...

श्री त्यागी : इजाजत मिली नहीं और मैरिट्स डिस्कस हो रही हैं। जब आपने परमिट नहीं किया तो मैरिट्स कैसे डिस्कस हो रही हैं?

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : त्यागी जी के खिलाफ़ मेरा भी एक प्वाएंट आफ़ आर्डर है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह उनके खिलाफ़ वाला प्वाएंट ऑफ़ आर्डर पीछे उठाइयेगा। यह बात सही है कि जब कंसेंट देनी हो तो मुझे मुख्तसर तौर पर पता लगाना चाहिए। लेकिन जो उनका नोटिस है उससे मुझे वाक़ी नहीं होता है कि कैसी डैलीबरेट लाई है और मैंने इस वास्ते उनसे मुख्तसर में बतलाने को कहा था। मामला चूंकि ज़मीन का है देश का है इसलिए मैंने भी ज़रूरी समझा कि मैं उसे समझ लूं।

श्री त्यागी : तो फिर परमिट किया जाये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : परमिट मैं इस तरीके से कैसे कर सकता हूं जब तक कि मुझे समझ में न आ जाये।

श्री त्यागी : और अब क्या समझना बाक़ी रहता है अख़बार में छप गया दुनिया समझ गई।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप देख रहे हैं कि इस तरीक़े से मैंने साफ़ बतलाया कि किस तरीक़े से माननीय मंत्री ने जानबूझ कर सत्य को छिपाया .....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप ख़त्म करें।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप पैरा 15 को देख लें जिसमें उन्होंने कई देशों के आंकड़ों को बतलाते हुए कहा है कि आस्ट्रेलिया, कैनाडा तथा अमरीका के क्षेत्रफलों में भी समय-समय पर फर्क होता रहा है और उससे सदन को गुमराह किया क्योंकि यह जितने आंकड़े हैं सब में और ख़ास तौर से अमरीका और कैनाडा में बढ़ती ही हुई है घटती नहीं होती .....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अमरीका, आस्ट्रेलिया और दूसरों का इसमें क्या सम्बन्ध आता है?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : माननीय मंत्री ने आस्ट्रेलिया के बारे में सदन को यह बतला कर गुमराह किया है कि घटती बढ़ती वहां भी होती रहती है। उसे आप ज़रा ध्यान से देखिये आस्ट्रेलिया के कोई अंक बदले नहीं?

खाली एक द्वीप जहां बरफ़ आ गई थी यानी वहां बस्ती नहीं है उसको आस्ट्रेलिया ने अपनी राजी खुशी से छोड़ दिया है इसलिए कुछ हजार वर्ग किलोमीटर जमीन कम हुई है ....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य अब तो खत्म ही कर दें।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अब मैं केवल एक मोटी बात कह दूं कि माननीय मंत्री अक्सर हवाई जहाज और दूसरे सुधरे हुए तकनीकों का जिक्र करते हैं तो यह इस प्रश्न से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं रखता क्योंकि सर्वे का काम 190 वर्ष से चल रहा है और एक एक इंच जमीन भारत की नाप ली गई है। हो सकता है कि कई तफ़सील की बातें मालूम हो लेकिन कुल जमा जो भारत का क्षेत्रफल है उसके बारे में फर्क होना असम्भव है....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : डाक्टर साहब बहुत हो गया।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : इसलिए सुधरे हुए तकनीकों का जिक्र करना फिजूल और बेमानी है।

मैं आप से एक अर्ज और कर दूं। मैंने माननीय मंत्री के एक अफसर को एक खत लिखा 2 जुलाई को। उनका नाम मैं नहीं लेता हूं क्योंकि वह मंत्री जी के खिलाफ़ बात जाती है हालांकि मैंने साफ़ कर दिया था कि मैं संसदीय मामलों के चलते हुए यह खत लिख रहा हूं लेकिन अभी तक उनका कोई जवाब नहीं आया है। सर्वे के यह सबसे बड़े अफसर हैं। इसलिए मैं मानता हूं कि यह असत्य बात उन्होंने कहीं और सदन को गुमराह किया।

श्री त्यागी : यह कितना डिस्कशन हुआ है यह इसके लिए हुआ है कि यह इन आर्डर है या नहीं और क्या उसके बाद फिर दुबारा मैरिट्स पर डिस्कशन होगा ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर मैंने इजाजत दी तो होगा।

श्री त्यागी: मैं इससे इत्तिफाक नहीं करता।

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): Mr. Speaker, this is the first time that I am having the doubtful honour of facing a privilege motion. With your permission, Sir, may I make a few general observations?

The motion for breach of privilege is the strongest weapon in the armoury of Parliament. The Minister can be questioned, he may be asked to make a statement, he may be censured, but when you bring a motion of breach of privilege against a Minister, you are using the strongest weapon that Parliament has in its armoury.

Now, the question of privilege does not depend upon parties. It does not depend upon my hon. friends behind me, or the hon. gentlemen opposite. Privilege is a question in which the whole House is interested, because the whole House is interested in seeing that our debates are not obstructed, that no prejudice is caused to our discussion and that we have a free discussion in this House. Therefore, as I said, it is rarely and on fit occasions that a notice of a motion for breach of privilege should be raised in this House.

But, what is happening today? If a Minister tries to mislead the House, certainly the strongest action should be taken against him. I go further. As I have myself held, in another context and in another capacity, if he, improperly holds back information from the House, certainly it is a matter which the House should frown upon. But if a mistake is committed, or an incorrect statement is inadvertently made, it is a case for breach of privilege? Ministers have hundreds of questions to answer, innumerable statements to make. After all, they are human and not infaliable. For every such mistake or incorrest state-

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

ment if a Member were to rush to this House with a motion for breach of privilege . . . (*Interruptions*). May I finish please? If for every such mistake or incorrect statement, a member were to rush to this House with a motion of breach of privilege, far from enhancing the dignity of the House, we are lowering it. Thereore, I would appeal to the hon. Members opposite that if they value the dignity of this House, then motions for breach of privilege . . . (*Interruptions*).

Shri Maurya (Aligarh): Ministers are lowering themselves by giving wrong information or making wrong statements.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : पहले मुझे मंत्री महोदय का स्टेटमेंट सुन लेने दीजिये ।

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर इसी पर है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : पहले मुझे मंत्री महोदय को सुन लेने दीजिये ।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि वह प्रिविलेज मोशन पर बोलें । अभी और सब बातें क्यों कह रहे हैं । इसी पर बोलें ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : वह सत्य नारायण की कथा क्यों कहने लगे । हमें उपदेश क्यों कर रहे हैं ।

Shri M. C. Chagla: Sir, you are more familiar than anybody else, with the procedure in the House of Commons. You have studied the proceedings there. You know how rarely motions of privilege are brought there.

Mr. Speaker: That is exactly what I have said in the ruling that I gave the other day. I have come to the same conclusion and I have used exactly the same words in my ruling. I have held that incorrect statements do not give any provocation for a breach of privilege motion. Similarly, inaccuracies can creep in, there can be mistakes but they do not constitute breach of privilege. I agree with the hon. Minister, so far as that is concerned.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : अगर कोई भूल से जहर खा ले तो क्या बच जायेगा । गलती से खा ले तो भी कैसे बच सकेगा ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप बैठ जाइये ।

Shri M. C. Chagla: May I come to the merits of the question? It is a simple question and I will take only five or ten minutes. The hon. Member, Dr. Lohia, has ranged far and wide, but I am restricting myself to the motion of privilege, of which notice has been given. May I remind you, Sir, that we are having a full-dressed debate on the question of the area of India next week and whatever dissatisfaction Dr. Lohia may have with the statement which I have placed on the Table of the House can be discussed on that occasion?

Now if you look at the notice of motion with regard to the breach of privilege it says that the Minister of Education concealed the facts and misled the House in his statement about differences in area of India in the information given to UNO, that the figures about the areas as given by the Prime Minister in the reply to unstarred question of 16th May, 1965, clearly indicate that there is considerable difference in the figures of 1961 and 1964.

May I draw your attention to the answer given by the Prime Minister? It is:—

"Yes, from 1961 onwards the Central Statistical Organisation has been supplying area figures

to the UN Statistical Office for the UN Demographic Yearbook;

(b) Yes, there has been some variation;

(c) and (d). A statement is enclosed."

If you kindly look at the statement, in 1961 the figures given is 29,49,275 and in 1962 it is 32,76,395. This is the gravamen of Dr. Lohia's charge but somehow he has overlooked the note appended to this statement that the figures for 1961 excluded areas in respect of which the 1961 census figures of population were not available at the time of report.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं ने इसको पढ़कर सुनाया था । आप बैठे हुए हैं, यह क्या हो रहा है। मंत्री महोदय कहते हैं कि ओवरलुक किया है। मैं ने तो पढ़ कर सुनाया था ।

Shri M. C. Chagla: These figures were supplied by us to the United Nations for a specific purpose. Those were demographic purposes. They wanted to know not only the area but the population. I have got the correspondence here. The census took place n 1961 and we told them that the census figures were not complete and, therefore, we would only supply the figures of those areas where the census was complete.

I will give you now the figures of the areas which were not supplied and if you add up 29,49,275 to those figures, you will get the figure of 32,76,394. I will give you the figures where the census was not complete.

	sq. km.
Jammu and Kashmir	.. 2,22,800
Goa, Daman and Diu	.. 3,693
Dadra and Nagar Haveli	.. 489
Pondicherry	.. 479
NEFA	.. 31,424
Nagaland	.. 16,488

Area of 674 miles (1,746 sq. Km.) this is because the areas of some States supplied by the Surveyor-General were revised on subsequent surveys and there was some discrepancy. The total comes to 3,27,119. If you total 29,49,275 and 3,27,119 and the total comes to 32,76,394 and the difference is only of one mile.

I have got letters written by us pointing out to the United Nations that we are only supplying provisional figures because the census area is not complete. I will read out one letter to clear all doubts from the mind of the House that the answer given by the Prime Minister was perfectly correct and I have not said anything to mislead this House. This was written to the United Nations on the 7th September, 1961 by the Director of the Statistical Bureau and I am reading the relevant paragraph:—

> "I may mention that only provisional summary results in regard to the 1961 population census of India are available at present and detailed tabulation by various socio-economic characteristics have not yet been completed. It has, therefore, been not possible to supply greater details in the questionnaire."

Shri Shinkre (Marmagoa): It relates to population only.

Shri M. C. Chagla: Yes, I am talking of population. What did I say on the last occasion, in the debate on 17th May? This is exactly what I said.

This is what I said:

> "In 1962, in 1963 and in 1964, the figures reported by the Central Statistical Organisation were over 32,76,000. For 1961, the figure was, less than this, 29,49,275 sq. k.m. But as we explained by the Central Statistical Organisation of the United Nations, it excluded areas in respect of which the 1961 census figures of population were not available....".

Sir, this was as far back as when the debate took place on the last occasion.

So, the Prime Minister's statement is perfectly correct. The discrepancies,

[Shri M. C. Chagla]

as clearly explained, were due to the fact that the figures supplied in 1961 were provisional based upon the census figures available. Subsequent figures, naturally, showed an increase in area because the later census figures were supplied.

This is the crux of the matter raised by Dr. Lohia. The charge against me is that I misled the House. He even said that I told lies to the House. May I submit that this is not right and it is not proper that a Minister should be charged with telling a lie? I can understand Dr. Lohia saying that I made an incorrect statement. What is the meaning of the word 'lie'? It is a moral charge against me. I resent it. I will be the last person in the world to tell a lie to this House. Does Dr. Lohia realise what is the meaning of the word 'lie'?

An hon. Member: He does'nt

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अगर कोई असत्य बोलने वाला आदमी जोर से कहे कि मैं असत्य नहीं बोलता हूं तो वह क्या सत्य हो जाता है ।

Shri M. C. Chagla: It is not only a reflection on me but it is actually a reflection on the Prime Minister because, through me, indirectly he is trying to attack the Prime Minister as the Prime Minister gave that answer.

Sir, I say with absolute confidence that the statement made by the Prime Minister was correct in every respect and I fully explained the discrepancies that arose.

May I also say this? My friend, Dr. Lohia, has raised the question about Kutch. I hope he has a patriotic sense. Our case is pending today before the international tribunal. I ask this House: Is it right that we should raise this question about Kutch? He has given a separate notice to you....

श्री मधु लिमये : कच्छ के दस्तावेजों के बारे में 72 घंटे हो गए हैं अभी तक खुलासा नहीं किया गया है । एक मिनट के अन्दर खुलासा होना चाहिए था ।

Shri M. C. Chagla: This is a matter of grave national importance. Dr. Lohia wants me, on the floor of this House, to explain to him our figures with regard to Kutch.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अंग्रेज का गुलाम अब पाकिस्तान की गुलामी करने चला है । मुझे देशभक्ति सिखाने चला है ।

Shri M. C. Chagla: I say, this is most unpatriotic and this is lacking in a sense of national security and safety.

Mr. Speaker: Some impatience was shown by certain hon. Members in the House when I was listening to the arguments on this subject. Shri Tyagi even raise a point of order.

It is a fact that I have been listening to these arguments for the last few days when these questions of breach of privilege have been raised in the House. It was even enquired of me whether after hearing the arguments and giving a decision—either giving my consent to it or not—a discussion also is to be had. I do realise that it is not right to use this weapon as has been done during the last few days and and even if I got to the extent of saying that that right has been misused, I would be right in the context.

As the hon. Minister of Education has said, it is a special right that would be used very sparingly and once in a while and the whole House might consider whether really there has been a breach of privilege, because the breach alleged is not against one Member but against the whole House; it should not be taken as a party or a factional question at all. The fact is that attention has been diverted from the Call Attention Notice and Adjournment Motion to breaches of privilege. Nobody bother

about those now, but now they only bother about breach of privilege; it is probably because I have been allowing these to be raised. (*Interruptions*).

श्री मधु लिमये : ऐसा आप क्यों कहते हैं । पांच मोशंज मैंने उठाई हैं जिन में से तीन आपने कमेटी के पास भेजी हैं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जो मैंने कमेटी के पास भी भेजी हैं वे वैसे भी शायद भेज देता । इस में कोई अजब बात नहीं है ।

श्री मधु लिमये : दो के बारे में आपने स्ट्रिक्चर्ज पास किए हैं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इसलिए मुझे ज्यादा एहतियात करनी होगी और देखना होगा कि अगर प्रिविलेजिज मोशन इस तरह से फ्रिक्वेंटली और इतनी ज्यादा लाई जायें तो मैं उनको हाउस के सामने लाऊं या न लाऊं । पहले अपने आप फैसला मैं करूं और फिर उन को हाउस के सामने लाने की जरूरत होगी तो लाऊंगा । जहां मैं समझूंगा कि कोई केस है उन को तो लाऊंगा दूसरी जो हैं उन को नहीं लाऊंगा, उन को कंसेंट नहीं दूंगा ।

अब रहा सवाल ब्रीच आफ प्रिवलेज का । मैं नहीं समझता हूं कि इसकी डिटेल्ज में मुझे जाने की जरूरत है, एक एक में जाने की जरूरत है, 16 मई को क्या कहा, अगस्त में क्या, 1964 में क्या कहा, इस सारी चीज में जाने की जरूरत है । मैं समझता हूं कि जानबूझकर गुमराह नहीं किया गया है और मिनिस्टर साहब ने ऐसा नहीं किया है कि जानबूझकर गलत बयानी करें और जानते हुए करें ।

If a Minister or any Member makes a statement himself knowing it to be false, then alone the question of breach of privilege arises. Otherwise, mistakes might creep in, some errors might be made, even some lapses might be committed, but they do not constitute in any case a breach of privilege. I have already ruled this and I repeat it now. There is no question of breach of privilege in this case and I rule it out.

Now Papers to be laid on the Table. Mr. S. K. Dey.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने आपको आठ कारण बताये थे जहां पर असत्य बोला गया है । "जानबूझ कर" के मैं ने आपको आठ कारण बताये थे । (इंटरप्शन्ज)

Mr. Speaker: I have called Mr. Dey.

12.27 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

MINERAL CONCESSION (SECOND AMENDMENT) RULES, 1966, AND THE MINERAL CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT (FIRST AMENDMENT) RULES, 1966

The Minister of Mines and Metals (Shri S. K. Dey): I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Notifications under sub-section (1) of section 28 of the Mines and Minerals (Regulation and Development) Act, 1957:—

(1) The Mineral Concession (Second Amendment) Rules, 1966, published in Notification No. S.O. 2170 in Gazette of India dated the 23rd July, 1966.

(2) The Mineral Conservation and Development (First Amendment) Rules, 1966, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1179 in Gazette of India dated the 30th July, 1966.

[*Placed in Library. See* No. LT-6836/66]

CINEMATOGRAPH (CENSORSHIP) SIXTH AMENDMENT RULES, 1966, ETC.

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting (Shrimati Nandini Satpati): On behalf of Shri Raj Bahadur, I beg to lay on the Table:

(1) A copy each of the following Notifications under sub-section (3) of section 8 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952:—

(i) The Cinematograph (Censorship) Sixth Amendment Rules, 1966, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 740 in Gazette of India dated the 21st May, 1966.

(ii) G.S.R. 1182 published in Gazette of India dated the 30th July, 1966.

(2) A statement showing reasons for delay in laying the Notification mentioned at (i) of item (1) above.

[*Placed in Library. See* No. LT-6837/66]

12.48 hrs.

MESSAGE FROM RAJYA SABHA

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following message received from the Secretary of Rajya Sabha—

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 111 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to enclose a copy of the Railway Property (Unlawful Possession) Bill, 1966, which has been passed by the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 17th August, 1966.

RAILWAY PROPERTY (UNLAWFUL POSSESSION) BILL

AS PASSED BY RAJYA SABHA

Secretary: Sir, I lay on the Table of the House the Railway Property (Unlawful Possession) Bill, 1966, as passed by Rajya Sabha.

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

NINTH REPORT

Shri Krishnamoorthy Rao (Shimoga): I present the Ninth Report of the Committee of Privileges.

12.49 hrs.

DELHI SALES-TAX BILL*

The Minister of Finance (Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to the levy of tax on sale of goods in Delhi.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to the levy of tax on sale of goods in Delhi."

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Yashpal Singh to oppose the introduction of the Bill.

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैराना) : इस बिल को मैं ओपोज करना चाहता हूं । दिल्ली में पहले से ही बहुत ज्यादा टैक्स बढ़े हुए हैं और दिल्ली के व्यापारी उन टैक्सों के नीचे दब चुके हैं । इस बिल के मुताबिक पार्लिमेंट को यह अधिकार नहीं रहेगा कि पार्लिमेंट समय समय पर टैक्स लगाये । इस बिल के मुताबिक यह अधिकार पार्लिमेंट से छीना जा रहा है । इस में यह कहा गया है :

"With that object in view, it is proposed to provide for the maxi-

*Published in Gazette of India Extraordinary Part II, Section, dated 22th August, 1966.

mum rate of seven per cent of general sales tax (as against the existing rate of five per cent) within which the Central Government may, by notification, fix the effective rate of sales tax."

यह बिल हमारी कांस्टीट्यूशन के खिलाफ़ है । सरकार अपनी मर्जी से नोटिस दे कर टैक्स नहीं बढ़ा सकती है । यह पार्लिमेंट की आथॉरिटी है । इस आथोरिटी को उससे छीना नहीं जाना चाहिए ।

एक बात यह भी है कि माननीय नन्दा जी ने यहां के व्यापारियों को पिछले महीने जो आश्वासन दिलाया था यह बिल उस आश्वासन के भी विरुद्ध जाता है ।

तीसरी बात यह है कि इस वक्त जो पांच प्रतिशत टैक्स है वहां जरूरत से ज्यादा है और सात प्रतिशत टैक्स बढ़ाने का सरकार को कोई अधिकार नहीं है । आपकी आज्ञा से, अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस सदन से मैं प्रार्थना करता हूं कि इस बिल को पेश करने की इजाजत न दी जाए ।

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): I rise to oppose the introduction under rule 72 of the Rules of Procedure. For the third time within the incredibly brief span of less than a week, it is my painful duty to oppose the motion for leave for introduction of the Bill in this House. Last Tuesday, the same remissness or carelessness or perfunctoriness of the Treasury Benches was brought before the House, and the Deputy-Speaker upheld my point of order and it was recommitted to the Ministry for fresh action under the rules. Last Friday, you came within an ace of upholding the point of order. Be that as it may, the Bill went through late in the evening.

Today, again, may I invite your attention to the financial memorandum appended to the Bill, which is wholly contrary to or at least not in consonance with the rules of procedure? At the outset, I may make it clear to the House and to you that I am not a stickler for rules. I may humbly submit that I am a respecter of rules, because I believe that unless the rules are observed, work in the House will become chaotic gradually, by and by, and I believe that what the rule of law is to a parliamentary democracy, so is the rule of rules to a democratic parliament.

Will you kindly bestow your attention on rule 69?

Rule 69 reads thus:

"(1) A bill involving expenditure shall be accompanied by a financial memorandum....."

What that memorandum should be like is then mentioned.

"....which shall invite particular attention to the clauses involving expenditure and shall also give an estimate of the recurring and non-recurring expenditure involved in case the Bill is passed into law.".

It was on this ground that the Jayanti Bill was postponed by almost a week now. I do not know why this sort of remissness, inertia or laziness has come over this Government; I do not know why this kind of somnolent complacence of the moribund Government as regards the rules is there; I do not know why with all their paraphernalia of secretaries, joint secretaries, deputy secretaries, assistant secretaries, private secretaries and personal assistants these mistakes still occur in such a matter as this, which can be easily detected; I have worked single-handed, and even so I have been able to find out this error.

The financial memorandum is one more funny document bordering on the ludicrous. It says:

"Though the proposed legislation wholly replaces....." Kindly mark the words 'wholly replaces'.

I do not know who the draftsman is. It says:

"....wholly replaces the existing rules...."

Shri Warior (Trichur): Wholly?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Wholly, that is, completely, entirely.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may address me.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I thought he had not heard me, and, therefore, I was explaining it to him. After all, this House has to vote on this motion. He had probably thought that the word was derived from 'hole. The word here is "w-h-o-l-l-y". The financial memorandum further reads:

"....wholly replaces the existing sales tax law applicable in Delhi, it maintains the basic structure..."

It wholly replaces and yet it retains the basic structure. Even that is not so bad, but what follows is certainly something very revealing about the capacity of this Government to handle even minor matters. It says:

"The only important change, which has any financial bearing, and which is proposed to be made through this Bill, is the setting up of an Appellate Tribunal...."

Now, rule 69 of our Rules of Procedure is mandatory. I hope you will not exercise your discretion in the Treasury Benches' interest today.

Shri Sonavane (Pandharpur): Why should he anticipate it?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may mention the points very briefly.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I am very brief in fact. I shall be briefer than some of my colleagues have been here in this House, and much briefer; and I would request you to be patient a little. The wording in rule 69 is:

'shall invite particular attention to the clauses.....'.

The financial memorandum is a very brief memorandum and it consists of only about ten lines, but there is not a single clause mentioned in the memorandum. Not a single clause is mentioned therein. I had to spend a few minutes going through the 'bulkyish' Bill, to find out where the clauses would be which would involve expenditure. I turned page after page and the same dull drab type confronted me; ultimately my eyes alighted on two clauses. I am sorry because I have no personal assistance. I could not flag them. But there are two clauses somewhere tucked away in the body of the Bill. I shall not weary the House with the details. But there are two clauses, which have not been mentioned in the memorandum....

Mr. Speaker: His first point is that the clauses are not mentioned in the memorandum. What is his other point?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: That is the main thing.

Mr. Speaker: I have noted that namely that the clauses ought to have been specifically mentioned in the memorandum.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I have to convince the House, I suppose, because the House has to vote on the motion.

Mr. Speaker: I was asking him for the second point or the second objection.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Then, there is a clause which refers to the Sales Tax Commissioner besides a Sales Tax Appellate Tribunal. That is there in the body of the Bill. If you would permit me, I shall mention the number of the clause also. I shall not take as much time as Shri Chagla did a little while ago. Here it is, I have got it; it is clause 9. Then, there is another clause, namely clause 12. These clauses which should have been mentioned in the memorandum have not been mentioned there at all. But rule

69 makes it obligatory and leaves no discretion. The only discretion is in the proviso, but the proviso does not help you or the House or the Minister. I am referring to the proviso to sub-rule (2) of rule 69. Fortunately, clause 9 is in thick type, though not in italics; it is in thick type; it is in bold type, and, it refers to the commissioner of sales-tax. I do not know if it is the old thing being continued. If that were so, there was no need to mention it or to put it in thick type in the body of the Bill. If it was an old thing to be continued in future, then there was no need for that. But if it is a new thing involving new expenditure, if it seeks to create a new institution or new authority which involves expenditure, then it must be mentioned in the memorandum, if not by quoting the clause, at least by a reference to the provisions in the clause. Now, neither of the two clauses which are in thick type in the body of the Bill is mentioned in the memorandum, nor is there any reference even by a remote suggestion to this clause relating to the commissioner of sales tax.

In view of both these facts, I do submit that in the interests of promoting the efficiency of the House, particularly of the Treasury Benches, which have been woefully lacking in that essential quality in recent times, I do hope that you would take them to task for this lapse, because we are taken to task also in some cases. I shall just mention only one instance. If we on this side of the House are five minutes late in giving notice of a motion in the Notice Office, it is taken up only as for the next day, and not for that day. We lose our rights, and we are almost deprived of our rights, so to say, if we are five minutes late. But here are the Treasury Benches, in their serried ranks, with all their hordes behind them; and they cannot do even this small thing. Please, therefore, hold over this Bill till they give a correct memorandum.

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: So far as I can see the objections of Shri Yashpal Singh, they relate to the provisions of the Bill, and those can be taken care of only when the Bill is debated upon here and not before that.

So far as Shri Kamath's objection is concerned, if I have understood him correctly, it is this. Of course, he was very fulsome in his speech, but I am afraid that I have not quite caught the point.

Mr. Speaker: The only point is that rule 69 makes it incumbent upon the Minister that a Bill involving expenditure shall be accompanied by a financial memorandum, and in that financial memorandum particular or special attention is to be invited to the clauses involving expenditure. That has not been done in this case.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): He is the watchdog of our finances.

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: All that I can say is this..

Mr. Speaker: An estimate of the recurring and non-recurring expenditure is given, but special attention has to be invited to the particular clauses involving expenditure, and that has not been done in this financial memorandum.

13 hrs.

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: So far as the clauses are concerned, the accusation that the clauses involving expenditure have not been mentioned in the financial memorandum is perfectly correct. But we have said what are the things contemplated. If you kindly look at the financial memorandum, of course a certain amount of levity has been created by the language used, 'Though the proposed legislation wholly replaces the existing sales tax law applicable in Delhi, it maintains the basic structure and the scheme of the existing Act'.

But we felt the necessity of saying this because if the Bill is passed, in the new Act the scheme will be maintained as it was in the previous Act.

[Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri]

The only real departure is in the matter of setting up an appellate tribunal. In respect of that, we have mentioned in the financial memorandum as to what would be the financial implications thereof, though the point made by Shri Kamath is perfectly correct that the particular clauses in the Bill which refer to this have not been mentioned. If it is contended that because of this the Bill should not be introduced today, I would say that the House has got the right to condone a mere irregularity and not an illegality. I would, therefore, request the House to condone that irregularity and allow the Bill to be introduced. If it is not acceptable....

Shri Maurya (Aligarh): Let us hear the Law Minister.

Mr. Speaker: The first was that a Bill involving expenditure shall be accompanied by a financial memorandum which shall invite particular attention to the clauses involving expenditure. That has not been done. My difficulty is that there is no discretion also left with the Speaker so far as this provision is concerned. There is a proviso that in case the clauses involving expenditure are not printed in thick type, the Speaker can permit the Minister concerned to bring such clauses to the notice of the House. But here it is something else. If the Law Minister or others can help.... (*Interruptions*). Order, order. I do not find any escape out of this rule.

Shri Daji (Indore): Why should you be anxious for escape ?

Mr. Speaker: I would request the Minister to make up the deficiency and then bring forward the Bill tomorrow.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Thank you.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): The officer in charge in the Ministry must be taken to task. We are ashamed of it.

The Minister of Law (Shri G. S. Pathak): It is not my Ministry.

13.04 hrs.

MOTION *RE*: FIFTY-FIFTH REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker: Shri Surendranath Dwivedy has to move the motion standing in his name. If I may be permitted, I may just say a few words in the beginning so far as this is concerned.

This is an extraordinary step that we have taken because during the last so many years since independence we have not discussed any report of the Public Accounts Committee. This is the first time we are discussing it; I am talking of the period since independence; in the pre-independence days, it might have been discussed.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): We are much more democratic.

Mr. Speaker: As I said, no report has been discussed since independence My predecessor as well as myself have laid down, whenever there was an occasion for it, that the report of the Public Accounts Committee which contains so many matters should not be discussed, but a specific issue over which there is divergence of opinion between the Committee and a Minister can certainly be brought before the House and discussed. The House has got that authority, not that it hasn't. The authority is ultimately with the House and it can discuss, but it should be confined to a specific issue, because if the reports are to be discussed, they contain so many things, the discussion would not be specific, many members would refer to different things and there would be rather a confused discussion which might not enable us to come to a definite decision.

Therefore, in the case of the 55th Report, I have allowed a discussion because this is pertaining to a specific issue and not to other things. That arose out of the 50th Report of the Committee. The 55th Report relates only to one issue and not to others.

Therefore, I have allowed that to be discussed.

The 50th Report of course contains many other things also. What we are discussing is the 55th Report. Therefore, nothing should be brought from the 50th Report that is not referred to in the report we are going to discuss (*Interruptions*). Where the 55th Report makes a reference to the 50th Report, that can be referred to but not other things in the 50th Report.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : उदाहरण के लिये भी नहीं ?

Shri Daji (Indore): We can use the 50th Report as we can use any other report of the Committee.

Mr. Speaker: It is the 55th Report we are discussing. It has made certain remarks, observations and comments; complimentary or uncomplimentary, they are there. The discussion should be confined to those observations, accusations or comments of the Committee; no new accusations, fresh blame or other things should be brought into that.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: What is this? Kindly explain to us.

श्री मधु लिमये : इसका मतलब समझ में नहीं आया ।

Mr. Speaker: The most important thing that I have to bring to the notice of the House is that the PAC is a House in miniature. Its decisions should be respected and its dignity enhanced. There all parties work together in team-spirit and no note of dissent is appended nor allowed. They work in the interest of the nation and of the House on behalf of the House.

Now, certain substitute motions have been tabled from both sides. If these motions and amendments are allowed, there would be great divergence of opinion and the Report of the Committee would be criticised; either they would be complimenting the Committee or criticising it, which would not be desirable for the future smooth functioning of the PAC.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): Correct.

Mr. Speaker: We might take the conclusions of the Committee as they are; the observations the Committee have made might be accepted on all sides, and then what consequences should follow may be discussed, rather than the merits or the reasoning of what the PAC have given.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Therefore, the 50th Report also comes in.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): It can be upheld.

Mr. Speaker: If at this moment we go into those details, there would be divergent views, reasoning, argument or other things on what the Committee have done; that would divide the Members of different parties in the PAC in future deliberations. Therefore, that danger also must be avoided.

In the end, I might make an appeal, because I have those substitute motions and observations might be made as the Members want, but the substitute motions may not kindly be moved, so that there might be no divergence of opinion. I would expect all Members to see to that because that would be a very dangerous precedent if we just now allow these substitute motions to be moved.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: We fully appreciate not your ruling but your advice to us.

Mr. Speaker: It is no ruling, it is for the House to decide.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I agree that this particular report, the 55th Report is being discussed in a very extraordinary manner. Generally the House never discusses these reports.

About the substitute motions 1 to 5, after all, we have not said anything about the report as such, we have

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

simply appreciated their work. In a substitute motion appreciating the work of the Public Accounts Committee or its Chairman.....

Mr. Speaker: If after my request and appeal, the House wants....

Some hon. Member: No, no....

Shri Raghunath Singh: No substitute motion, no amendment.

श्री मधु लिमये : ऐसा कैसे हो सकता है ।

Mr. Speaker: I think it would be advisiable for this side also to accept my advice.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Kindly hear me. My contention is only this. I fully agree with you that we should not move any substitute motion commenting on the report of the Public Accounts Committee, but what are our substitute motions?—that this House having considered the report, recommends to the Government that a commission should be appointed. But the substitute motion of Shri K. C. Pant is:

> "This House having considered the 55th Report of Public Accounts Committee notes with satisfaction Government's decision to appoint a high-level committee...."

We do not know. It is anticipatory. So, I feel that we shall be failing in our duty if, even after discussion, we cannot recommend to the Government that a high powered committee should be appointed.

Mr. Speaker: There is no need to take this particular substitute motion. Even conceding that it may not be harmful today, if a precedent is created, it would be harmful for the future. Therefore, we have to safeguard, guard against those contingencies.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस प्रस्ताव के बारे में आपने अपील की है और उस पर गम्भीरता से विचार करना हमारा फर्ज भी हो जाता है । लेकिन एक बात मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूं कि 17 मई से इस रपट को लेकर जो घटनायें इस सदन में हुई हैं । 17 मई को पहले सुब्रह्मण्यम साहब का वक्तव्य आया कि वह उस समय इसके मंत्री नहीं थे, फिर 18 मई को उनका दूसरा वक्तव्य आया, जिसमें....

श्री त्यागी (देहरादून) : आन ए पाइंट आफ़ आर्डर....

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं प्रोसीजर के बारे में कह रहा हूं, हल्ला क्यों कर रहे हैं ।

Shri Raghunath Singh: He is speaking on merits.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस वक्त मैं किसी चीज के लिए कि यह आ सकेगा, या नहीं आ सकेगा कोई राय नहीं दूंगा । मैंने एक जनरल अपील आपके सामने रखी है, जब बहस चलेगी तब देखा जायेगा

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं एक स्पष्टीकरण चाहता हूं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय यह स्पष्टीकरण की बात नहीं है ।

श्री मधु लिमये : यदि आपकी यह राय है कि इस प्रस्ताव पर बहस करना हमारी परम्परा के खिलाफ है और उस पर इस तरह की तरमीम लाना, संशोधन लाना यह भी अनुचित होगा तो मैं आपकी मारफत प्रधान मंत्री जी और सदन के नेता को विनती करूंगा कि पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी दोबारा अपनी राय देने के पश्चात् और अपने हमारे प्रिविलेज मोशन पर जो अपनी राय दी है, क्या उसके पश्चात् प्रधान मंत्री जी यह घोषणा करने को तैयार हैं कि औचित्य का भंग हुआ है । इतना तो कम से कम कह दें और मंत्री महोदय का इस्तीफ़ा देने को कहें । तब मैं यह मानने के लिए तैयार

है कि इस प्रस्ताव पर बहस न हो और संशोधन भी वापस लेने को तैयार हूं । इस का जवाब, अध्यक्ष महोदय, जरूर आना चाहिए ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं, इसकी जरूरत नहीं है ।

Shri K. C. Pant (Naini Tal): As you know, one of the substitute motions stands in my name. I have listened to you with great attention and respect. I assure you that I have no desire to add to your difficulties in the rather delicate and difficult situation to which you have referred yourself. We on this side of the House fully share your anxiety to uphold the prestige of the Public Accounts Committee, and I am sure in fact both sides of the House are united on this.

Since you feel that no substitute motion of any kind should be moved, I bow to your wisdom and hasten to offer to withdraw any substitute motion, if other substitute motions are also withdrawn.

This is not a question of petty party politics.

Shri Ranga: When you were speaking to us, was he able to prepare the text already? Are we to understand that he has known what you were going to say, and therefore he has come prepared with the reply? We do not understand this.

Mr. Speaker: Never had I any idea. This is beside the point.

Shri K. C. Pant: May I be allowed to continue?

I appreciate the gravity of your remarks and the difficulty in which the House found itself, and it was in a spirit of helpfulness that I was making the suggestion.

You were also pleased to refer to the scope of the discussion, and I would like to assure you on behalf of this side of the House that we shall try to respect both the spirit and the letter of the confines of the discussion which you have laid down here. Thank you.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): I want to limit my observations only to one point, and that is about the substitute motions. I think he has said that he withdraws. I think the question of withdrawal will come only after the motion has been moved as a matter of fact.

An hon. Member: He has offered.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I appreciate that. What I venture to submit is that this particular issue cannot be considered on party lines at all.

Your approach should be as much acceptable to the Opposition as to this side. If it is not acceptable to the Opposition, there is no use our saying anything on this particular issue.

The Public Accounts Committee is regarded both by the Opposition as well as by this side as a body of this House, representing this House, and it must be respected. We never want to create any precedents which will hazard the functioning of the Public Accounts Committee in an independent manner. That is the anxiety, and your observations, I am sure, came only out of that anxiety, and if that anxiety is understood, I think the Opposition as well as this side will be one on this. This is a point on which we have got to be of one mind.

I think these motions mean that if at this time we say that we approve the action of the Public Accounts Commiftee, it also implies that sometimes we may not approve of it. What I mean to say is that we should automatically consider, it should be taken for granted, that whatever has been said by the Public Accounts Committee is not in question. Let that thing be understood.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: That is very clear.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Whatever observations are made by the Public Accounts Committee are not in question, and therefore let it stay at that high level. That is exactly my submission. Let us not say we approve or disapprove. If we do it, we will be creating difficulties for ourselves.

What I am anxious is that if we bring the Public Accounts Committee into controversy somehow, that would be the most dangerous thing, because this will also reflect and react in a very dangerous manner . . ..

श्री मधु लिमये अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह तो सचिन चौधरी को सुबह्मण्यम लाये कन्ट्रोवर्सी में ।

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: .... on the composition of the Public Accounts Committee next time. Then there would be an effort made to see that the Public Accounts Committee is packed with such persons who are controllable, that the Public Accounts Committee should also have certain people from the Opposition who would be amenable.

I think we must maintain that the Public Accounts Committee is an absolutely independent body, and nothing should be done to that. The Opposition will lose nothing as a matter of fact. Mr. Pant was withdrawing his motion, and also others, because the Public Accounts Committee is not to be brought into controversy. I am not concerned with any other matter except that the Public Accounts Committee should not be brought into controversy. Once we say we approve, next time we can say, somebody can say, we disapprove. Therefore, let us consider this; it is no good until and unless it is acceptable to the Members of the Opposition. I do hope that they have an anxiety to keep the Public Accounts Committee at the highest level. I think it is only in that context that we have got to see that we do not bring the Public Accounts Committee into controversy.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): I am befuddled by the sudden expression of fear and anxiety that Members of this House from whichever side are perhaps likely to reflect upon the PAC. There is not remotest symptom or suggestion in that direction. On the contrary, whatever notices of substitute motions were given wanted to applaud the action of the PAC. What I do not understand is this. PAC produce reports which become public documents. Normally our practice is that we do not discuss them. But that does not mean to say that we shall never in future discuss them. And if we discuss them, God help us if we have to disapprove something done by a committee of ourselves, that sort of thing is never likely to happen as far as we can foresee. We have a right to discuss this matter certainly in this Parliament just as it is the right of the public to know the reports presented by the Public Accounts Committee; it is also something which we cannot take away. The reports of the Public Accounts Committee are before the public, public discussion is going on in relation to certain observations made in the Public Accounts Committee report, beyond which this discussion is not going to go. Members of Parliament are entitled, I submit, to express themselves and if in the process of expressing themselves they do happen to say certain things which militate against the party in power, we should not be inhibited from doing so and it should never be misconstrued as a reflection upon the Public Accounts Committee which we respect at a non-party level. We are absolutely unanimous in regard to the position of the Public Accounts Committee. I do not conceive of any situation wherein the Public Accounts Committee or the House wanted to work in a different way than the conventions today warrant. Therefore, without the slightest suggestion of disrespect for the Public

Accounts Committee, this House can discuss the Public Accounts Committee report which also is a public document communicated to the country about which editorials continue to be written in the newspapers and about which this House is going to have dissussion. Just starting a kind of scare about something which might or might not be said from one side or the other, we are inhibiting ourselves in a manner which appears to be particularly confounding. Merely by mentioning something we are raising some suspicions. When we saw Mr. Pant reading out of some typed script or something like that, naturally we thought that the thing was not quite as simple as it appeared to be. I am sorry to say so; normally we do not have the slightest intention of saying this . . . (*Interruptions.*)

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): The typed script is mostly from that side; not from this side.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: There was this rigmarole about the Public Accounts Committee being a wonderful instrument. We know it is a wonderful instrument; we cherish the Public Accounts Committee; none of us ever hinted a word or a suggestion in regard to the Public Accounts Committee to bring it into disrepute. On the contrary we have congratulated the Public Accounts Committee for having enabled the House and the country to have knowledge in regard to certain goings on. If those goings on are not to be discussed . . . (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Dwivedy may move his motion; I do not allow any further speeches . . . (*Interruptions.*)

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): I want to make an observation as this is a matter of procedure. As you said, rightly, after freedom for the first time the Public Accounts Committee report is being discussed. There is no provision laid down for discussion. It is not an ordinary motion. When there is no procedure, we refer back to the British parliamentary practice. There when the Public Accounts Committee report is brought before the House, usually the motion is moved by the Chairman and the Finance Minister replies to the debate. Here unfortunately, the Opposition Members had given this motion and so naturally there are fears . . . (*Interruptions.*) that a slant will be given to the discussion. What Prof. Mukerjee has said is very good so far as it goes but will the law or relevancy be adhered to in practice? You were good enough to lay down a very healthy practice and procedure for future guidance and we should follow that . . .

Shri Ramanathan Chettiar (Karur): On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: No point of order arises now.

Shri Ramanathan Chettiar: The hon. Member is under a misapprehension. In the House of Commons the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee is the leader of the Opposition, or a Member of the Opposition.

Shri Khadilkar: So, Sir, it is the responsibility of every Member of the House. The main observations and conclusions are before the House. No partisan attitude should be brought in. Whatever observations, they must be detached and objective. I would also appeal that the reply must come from the Finance Minister because it would be a healthy practice.

Shri A. C. Guha (Barasat): Sir, I have not been able to follow clearly the direction you have given to this House regarding the substitute motions. There are five motions. If they are introduced or moved, the House would vote on them; if one of them is to be accepted, the others would be rejected and so it will be creating a very bad precedent. The decision of the Chair should be that there should be no substantive or substitute motion; the only motion should be that the Public Accounts Committee Report should be discussed. That is the procedure followed in UK. In very special circumstances, we have taken up this discussion. I beg of you, Sir, not to allow any sub-

[Shri A. C. Guha]

stitute motions to be moved as this would mean voting and that the House would be divided on the merits or demerits of the Public Accounts Committee report. This would hamper the working of the Public Accounts Committee and the Estimates Committee.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): You have made certain preliminary remarks and then said that the House should decide whether the motions should be considered or not. I want you to ascertain the sense of the House whether the motions should be discussed or not and at that stage, you may announce that there should be no substitute motion at all.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): If I can make an appeal to you and to the House after all that has fallen from the lips of my friends, I may say this. In the House of Commons, whenever the Public Accounts Committee motion is discussed, no substitute motion is allowed; that is my information. In this case, I would appeal to you therefore either to give a ruling straightaway whether a substitute motion should be allowed; if you are not in a position to do so, we request you to leave it to the House, because we do not want to create a bad precedent which may not be desirable for the future of democracy in this country.

श्री मधु लिमये : आप को रूलिंग के बारे में सुनना पड़ेगा ।

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): I thought he wanted to be helpful but the statement made by the Leader of the House is certainly not so. Now, Sir, we realise that the advice given by you to the House is motivated by the highest considerations for upholding and promoting the status, dignity and prestige of the Public Accounts Committee and you rightly said it is the House itself in miniature. I do hope that the action the House will take today will not in any case be considered as a precedent for the future and every issue, whether it is about the Public Accounts Committee or the Estimates Committee or any other Committee, will be judged on its own merits. That is number one.

My next point is this. As a matter of fact, we were also impelled by the same consideration when we gave notice of the substitute motion—all of us. I have said in my substitute motion that "This House places on record its appreciation of the service rendered by the Committee in the national interest, and to maintain the highest standards of integrity in administration". I have suggested in that substitute motion that a Commission of Inquiry be appointed. That is all that I have said. You might perhaps take objection to the latter part of this motion. But may I plead with you and request you to consider whether it is not a fact that large numbers of people outside, the public, have reason to believe today that the strong recommendations made by the Public Accounts Committee in its 50th Report, which will not be discussed today, are sought to be ignored by the Government, by the party in power. Let us have an assurance on that point that the Government accept the recommendations made by the Public Accounts Committee, and let the Government, appoint a high-level enquiry body to enquire into the whole sordid deal with which that report deals. (*Interruption*). The 55th report does not mention any inquiry. Let the Minister make a statement that he accept the 50th report. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I am not going to say whether this substitute motion should be allowed or not. I will leave it to the House; let the House decide what it likes to do.

Several hon. Members *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let Shri Surendranath Dwivedy move his motion.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Let the Minister make a statement.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): When he makes a statement on the basis of the report of the Public Accounts Committee—the 50th Report—we will discuss that also here. You cannot ban us from discussing that and you cannot say that we should not refer to that. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: One Member of the party holds that view and another Member.. (*Interruption*).

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I never said, let them say it immediately.. (*Interruption*).

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: There seems to be a misunderstanding. I should like to say that in this very House on the 12th, it has been stated in terms of the requirements of the 50th report the Government has already decided to appoint a Committee. It has been stated. It has been stated by Shri T. N. Singh on the 12th, and further it was clarified by the Speaker. (*Interruption*). Will you permit me to clarify the position, Sir? We do not want to scuttle any motions and procedures. They have already promised an enquiry. What is the type of enquiry? May I point out that in the 50th report they have suggested that there should be a judge, that there should be a representative of the Comptroller and Auditor-General and the Chairman of the UPSC. It is all there. The question does not arise at all.

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप चलने दीजिये ।

श्री मधु लिमये : आपने जज कहा है कि . . .

Mr. Speaker: Let him move his motion and we shall see the point as it arises.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I beg to move:

> "That the Fifty-fifth Report of the Public Accounts Committee on the statement made on the 18th May, 1966, in the House by the Minister of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation relating to para 4.128 of the Fiftieth Report of the said Committee, presented to the House on the 5th August, 1966, be taken into consideration."

Sir, I do not want to go into the question about the advisability of this discussion, but in the beginning, I want to make it very clear that although not after Independence but before Independence, in the year 1944, there was not only a discussion of the PAC report in the then Central Legislative Assembly, and an amendment was also accepted.

In this motion, about this particular matter, I want to draw the attention of the House to a pre-Independence message given by our President. The President stated:

> "We are not willing or able to take action against anti-social elements. An honest and firm Government should be energetic in the matter of putting down corruption. It should try to remove deceit, and falsehood, intrigue and pusillanimity."

If you go into the details connected with subject-matter of the discussion today, you will be convinced and anybody in this House will also be convinced that it is nothing but deceit, falsehood, intrigue and corruption at the highest level and it also shows how anti-social elements in this country have spread their tentacles even over the administrative apparatus and how, with the active help, assistance and collaboration of Ministers, Secretaries and officers, they are changing the policy

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

of this Government according to their convenience. When I say this and while discussing this motion, I also agree with you and other friends that we are not discussing this to malign anybody; it is not an indictment against the Government. This is being discussed for upholding the very right of this Parliament.

What has been the Government's attitude to the PAC reports? It is very well known to you that there are several reports, pointing out lapses and irregularities on a number of occasions, but the Government has not taken any serious notice of them. I think that when we are discussing this, I must repeat, as you have rightly said, that the PAC after all is a miniature Parliament and its decision should be binding on the Government because it is a decision of the House. To go or not to accept its decision is flouting the decision of the House itself.

You know very well how in the 1950s, there was the Jeep scandal story and how many times the PAC came out with its report in which Shri T. N. Singh played a very active part. Ultimately, what happened? The Government closed the matter. They anhounced on 30th September, 1955 that the matter is closed. The principal person concerned was shielded and he was appointed as Minister on 3rd February, 1956. He had to go for other reasons later, but this person was shielded from the very beginning. This was in 1956, and now after 10 years we are discussing an affair which, according to me, is a sordid deal. If one has the time to scrutinise and see the entire thing, one would find that the Sirajuddin affair or the Mundhra affair pales into insignificance. Given time I shall be able to prove and show to this House how through the patronage of some dishonest political leaders, not only Aminchand Pyarelal group of firms have amassed vast wealth and property but hundreds and crores of Government money have been squandered and looted. It is nothing but daylight, legalised, robbery of public money and property.

I am not going into the other details, but one matter is already in the news; the question of appointment of an inquiry, etc. In this connection, I would like to know whether this enquiry will also include the conduct of the Minister of Food and Agriculture who is involved in the 50th report as well. But so far as I am concerned, I feel that the report of the PAC so far as this particular Minister is concerned, is full and complete. Whatever he has to say in defence he has placed before the PAC and before the House, and the PAC has taken a very unusual step of hearing him also. The PAC has come out with its report. It has not believed his story. The PAC has not accepted his arguments and the PAC has said that they will not modify their earlier recommendation.

Now, I would like this Government to tell us, why this double standard, if a Central Minister is involved in this affair? You know very well that once there was a definite allegation, and the Auditor-General came out with the Audit Report, that two Ministers—the Chief Minister of Orissa and another— have made a trade of Rs. 2 crores. It was Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who said that this will go to the PAC and the PAC is a supreme body.

Shri Tyagi: How is this relevant here? (*Interruption*).

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Unnecessary interruptions should not be made.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi (Hamirpur): Only relevant matters should be discussed now.

Mr. Speaker: I would request hon. members to confine themselves today to those things that are here. But

the other side also should not object, because in regard to those things that have already been brought on the floor of the House and are on record how can I shut them out?

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: On a point of order. Sir. You have said in the beginning of the debate that only whatever is mentioned in the 55th report will be referred to and no further allegations will be made. That is on record. (*Interruptions*).

श्री मौर्य (अलीगढ़) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, सिमली और नैटफेर का क्या होगा ?

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I want to be heard. If they do not went to hear me, I will not hear them. (*Interruptions*). If I am not allowed to speak, Mr. Dwivedy also will not be allowed to speak.

श्री मौर्य : अध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय सदस्य ने यह क्या कहा है ? (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Speaker: One member at a time. When he is speaking, others should hear him. That is all that has been said.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berhampur): Mr. Azad has said that Shri Dwivedy will not be allowed to speak.....

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: If I am not allowed to speak.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: Is he the arbiter of the House to decide that? (*Interruptions*).

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : इसमें आपत्ति करने की क्या बात है ? जो चोरी करते हैं, उन सबको बिलकुल नंगा किया जाएगा । (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Everyone shall sit down. Swamiji also should sit down.

स्वामी जी भी बैठ जायें ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : वह क्यों चिल्लाते हैं ?

श्री भागवत झा आजाद : तुम क्यों चिल्लाते हो ? * *

श्री रामेश्वरा नन्द : (*Interruption*)

Mr. Speaker: I would not allow such language to be used here. Those members are not fit to remain here who use such language. The House should take special notice that the level is deteriorating every day. Certain things have been said. Members degrade themselves and degrade the House as well. Such members are not fit to remain as members of the House, who use such language.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): May I submit to both sides that they might be heard patiently and there should be no interference except by you in the speech of any member?

श्री क० ना० तिवारी (बलहा) : आन ए पायंट आफ आर्डर, सर । स्वामी जी ने जो ** वर्ड कहा है क्या वह रिकार्ड पर रहेगा ? उस को एक्सपंज कर दिया जाये ।

Mr. Speaker: I am not hearing any points of order. There are no points of order; they are only obstructing the proceedings. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: If he has used the word ** I do not raise it as a point of order. Let it be on the record and let the country know what type of members are there.

श्री मौर्य : यह भी रिकार्ड पर रहे कि माननीय सदस्य ने कहा है** हम ने सुना है । हम आन ओथ कहने के लिये तैयार हैं कि उन्होंने ये शब्द कहे हैं । स्वामी जी के अपशब्द कहने से पहले, स्वामी जी के गुस्से होने से पहले, माननीय सदस्य ने कहा * * ।

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair *vide* col. 6995.

[श्री मौर्य]

मैं आन ओथ कह सकता हूं । जो मेम्बर्ज नजदीक बैठे हुए हैं, आप उन से पूछ लीजिए । मैं ने सुना है ।

Shri Bhagwat Jha Abad: He is absolutely wrong. I never said it. I cannot say this word.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) : अध्यक्ष महोदये, जो स्टेनोग्राफर यहां पर लिख रहे हैं, आप उन के रिकार्ड को देख लीजिए कि उन्होंने श्री भागवत झा आजाद के ये शब्द नोट किए हैं * * और तब स्वामी जी ने ये शब्द कहे हैं ।

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: If it is on record that I have said** I am not fit to be here. I have not said it. I can never say it. (*Interruptions*).

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर यह कहा गया है, तो यह दोनों तरफ से नाजेबा और नामुनासिब है । मैं रिकार्ड को देखूंगा । अगर ये शब्द हुए, तो मैं दोनों को निकाल दूंगा ।

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: My point of order is....

श्री मधु लिमये : माननीय सदस्य का पायंट आफ आर्डर क्या है ? वह किस बात को लेकर बोल रहे हैं ?

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Mr. Limaye has stood up hundreds of times on points of order and you have overruled him always. He should not grudge if once I stand up. (श्री मधु लिमये : मैंने केवल पूछा है ।) In the beginning you have said that this House is discussing the 55th report and no further allegations should be added to what has been mentioned in the report. Now Mr. Dwivedy has said that it is a fraud and so many other words that I cannot remember. You can see the record. Are these words and allegations mentioned in the 55th report? Why are these personal allegations made when there is no mention about them in the reports? Is he not going beyond that?

Mr. Speaker: So far as the point of order is concerned, I do not think I need interfere at this moment, because in regard to the words he has used, he draws those conclusions from the observations that have been made.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): No....

Mr. Speaker: I said, he is drawing those inferences. I did not say that the PAC has used those words or drawn those inferences. The PAC has made certain observations and he draws those inferences. I would appeal to the member who is on his legs that he should not go beyond the scope of the discussion, as I have already held.

Shri A. C. Guha: There is a danger. If he can draw those conclusions, other members can draw other conclusions also that would mean dividing the House on the P.A.C. report. My objection is not on the contents of the motion but on principle. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: If you permit me, Sir, Mr. Kamath also had made some reference about this enquiry and my friend who has just....

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Is he intervening or what?

Mr. Speaker: At this stage, the Leader of the House wants to say something about what is happening..

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: In the middle of my speech, he cannot say anything. After I finish, he might say. How can this be allowed, unless it is a point of order?

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair *See* also col. 6994.

Mr. Speaker: Then he might continue. He would kindly confine himself to the issues that are involved.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I am entirely relevant to the issues.

Mr. Speaker: Please do not go out of the issues involved.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I do not go out. We must give the highest regard to the recommendations of the PAC. Once we adopt this principle, whatever may be the recommendations anywhere else, if the PAC has finally taken a decision, that will be binding. In this matter, the PAC has made some recommendations about a particular Minister, which we are now discussing. Since the PAC's decision is of such importance, we must have the same standard applicable in all cases. Therefore, after the PAC has given its 55th report, there is no reason to refer it to any other body. The only thing I am concerned with it, it must be accepted and the recommendations must be implemented.

After reading the PAC report, I have come to the conclusion that the particular Minister has shown utter irresponsibility and indiscretion and has made an attempt to evade, confuse and mislead. It is very clear. I will not go further.

I will only quote what you had to say while rejecting the privilege motion:

> "The whole affair, of course is an unfortunate episode. That I must admit in the very beginning. There have been errors committed. Lapses have occurred and so much of confusion is there that one regrets all that has happened. But I have not to decide whether the Minister should resign. That is for the Minister to decide or for the Prime Minister."

Mr. Speaker: There was a demand in the notice that the Minister should resign.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: He has tried to confuse the House very much, as corroborated by what you have said. After this preliminary remark, any self-respecting person would have resigned and the Government should not have tolerated him even for a moment.

Mr. Speaker: I was only referring to the notice that had been given and the demand made in that notice.

श्री मधु लिमये : जो रिकार्ड पर है, माननीय सदस्य उसी का उल्लेख कर रहे हैं। फिर एतराज क्यों ;

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं नहीं कर रहा हूं।

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Sir, let me go on. It is being argued that there is no pecuniary benefit, there is no *mala fide* intention, after all it is an error of judgment. I want to point out to you, Sir, and to the House, even if there is no *mala fide* intention, even if it is an error of judgment on the part of the Minister, it is a case of irresponsibility, it is a mistake of a high order. He cannot afford to be irresponsible as any other citizen. I will quote, Justice Chagla, not Minister Chagla, as he was then:

> "If the transaction is improper and unjustified, the constitutional responsibility is that of the Minister."

He further says emphatically:

> "The Minister must take full responsibility for the acts of his subordinates. He cannot be permitted to say that his subordinates did not reflect his policy or acted contrary to his wishes and directions."

In this case, the Public Accounts Committee, after hearing Shri Subramaniam, has neither said that this is proper nor justifiable.

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy.]

Another argument that is advanced is, after all, can a Minister not use his discretion? It is argued that he has done it in his direction. It is asked, can he not modify the order in his discretion? I accept that a Minister can modify an order, and he has done it on his ministerial discretion. But any modification of such an oredr must be acceptable to fair-minded people as just and proper. It is not only that justice must be done, as Justice Das put it in the Das Commission Report, but justice must appear to have been done. In this case, I feel it is a blunder, it is an indiscretion, it is a case of discretion used wrongly, and the Minister concerned has no business to continue in his office.

I will quote one instance—I do not want to go into the details. My hon. friends may remember the case of Mr. John Belcher, a junior minister in the British Cabinet when Mr. Atlee was the Prime Minister in 1948. He was having a junior post in the Board of Trade. Because of his association with unsocial elements he had to pay the price. His wife got a sewing machine from a concern which was connected with the Board of Trade. Minutes after the allegation was made in the Press, the whole machinery of the British Government went into action, tribunals were appointed and the Minister immediately resigned although there was no report of the Tribunal that he was in any way concerned with that firm or anything wrong was done. We must have some precedent, some tradition in this country.

The Minister says "I have a clear conscience, I am not going to resign". Probably, that day, when he signed this order, his conscience had cleared out and no conscience was left in him, as I shall presently point out. Why did the Minister, if his conscience was so clear, take so much of the time of the House, waste so much time of the House, on the 17th and also on the 18th when he made his statement? He could have very clearly stated the entire position. Why did we again refer it back to the Public Accounts Committee and put them in an embarrassing position? So far as the Minister is concerned, the Minister has not told the truth. He has admitted it earlier. In his evidence—I do not know whether I have the time to go into all this, but it will not be denied because it is here in the evidence—he has stated when he passed the order he did not know about this firm, whereas there is a statement in which he says that he know about this firm when he passed this order in 1962. There were many things known about this firm and even in this House it had been raised several times. Even in the Eleventh and Twenty-Fourth Reports of the Public Accounts Committee, they have come out with strictures against this particular firm and what the Iron and Steel Controller and the Ministry concerned have done. In this House, in 1958, we discussed the report of the Estimates Committee, showing how the Hindustan Steel Limited, the Iron and Steel Controller and the Government are involved in these affairs, how these shady transactions are going on. All these things were known.

In his evidence, when he was asked when Mr. Jit Paul went to him whether there was any other person, his answer was: "I do not remember". When he was asked: "Was it your first meeting?" he replied: "Yes. I think so". These are his words. I am quoting from the evidence. If that is so, why was he hiding the facts. If he had mentioned this in the House, then the entire truth would have come out. The fact remains, that that was not the first time when Mr. Jit Paul met him. He had met him three or four times before. I maintain that he had met him three or four times regarding these matters of import and export of

iron and steel. Here is a letter—if you will permit me, I shall place it on the Table of the House—written by Shri Jit Paul. This is from 13, Alipore Road, Calcutta, 27, dated 25th January, 1963. It says:

"Dear Shri Subramaniam ji,

I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to you for very kindly sparing your time..."

Mr. Speaker: Is it the original or a copy?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: It is a copy. I certify it to be a true copy of the original. It says:

"I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to you for very kindly sparing your time and granting me a second interview on Monday....." *Interruptions*).

Let it be denied. This is a copy. I cannot get the original. I will certify it to be authentic.

Mr. Speaker: He will have to certify, according to my earlier decision, that he has seen the original himself and certify that it is a copy of that original that he has seen.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I will certify that and place it on the Table of the House.

[*Placed in Library, See* No. LT-6896/66]

Shri Tyagi: Be sure that it is a true copy of the original.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Shri Tyagi must know that I have not said a word in this House which is not corroborated by facts later on. What I am saying is this. This letter is dated 25th January, 1963 wherein he says:

"I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to you for very kindly sparing your time and granting me a second interview on Monday, the 31st December, 1962, to explain our position in the matter of our claim against Messrs. Hindustan Steel Limited *vis-a-vis*.....Jit Paul".

Therefore, he has met him several times. He knew about this all this time. The Minister has devoted more than a page in his evidence to say:

"After all, I grant interview to anybody who comes to me. Whenever one comes to me, how can I refuse an interview?"

I have here telegrams and letters to show how a retired IPS gentleman working in the Hindustan Steel, who wanted to see him during this period, was sending telegrams after telegrams seeking an interview with him and till 1964 he was not given time to meet him. But this particular gentleman, Jit Paul comes up suddenly and over-night he has been granted an interview, overnight the order was changed and all that happened. Therefore, it raises suspicion in the mind of everybody.

Now, I will proceed further. The Minister himself has admitted in his evidence that repeated letters, at least twice, were sent by the Iron and Steel Controller. They did not carry out his orders of 28th June, 1963 and the Iron and Steel Controller sent repeated enquiries. In the same context, when he was cross-examined by the Public Accounts Committee he himself has said: "Even now I could not say that it is free from suspicion". This is when he wanted to amend the orders. He says: "it is not free from suspicion". The question arises, if he had suspected this, if suspicion arose in his mind, did he enquire about it before he passed the orders? Did it arise in his mind that since the matter was of a suspicious nature, he should hold an enquiry? Did he hold an enquiry into this matter? Did he suspend the two officers involved in this? Who were the Steel Controllers? They were Shri Bam and Shri Banerjee, whose letters are there in this Public Accounts Committee's

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy.]

Report. They were hand-in-glove with this firm.

About the Iron and Steel Controller's Office this is what the Public Accounts Committee has said:

> "It seems that the parties took the office of the Iron and Steel Controller for granted to issue them any licence whenever they required etc. etc."

Knowing fully well and these things, what was the Minister doing? The Minister has said:

> "I knew something about this firm, and therefore my general attempt was to see that some discipline was restored in the iron and steel trade."

I do not want to go into those things. Again, he admits in the course of his evidence that there was a file in the Ministry concerning Messrs. Amin-chand Pyarelal. After knowing this, how could he pass this order? Therefore, what can he say? So, he says that it was just to give a chance to somebody, there was no consideration.

14 hrs.

I will again quote Justice Chagla. I am making a distinction between Justice Chagla and Minister Chagla. Justice Chagla said in the Mundhra affairs:

> "there was some driving force behind this drama and the Minister says that he did not supply that force."

What was the driving force which drove the Food Minister to pass an order within 48 hours, which is quite unusual? I, therefore, ask him to clarify whether before passing this order there was any telephone talk by him with any other Minister about this particular firm. Since this firm is in Jullundur and his predecessor was from Jullundur...

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Sir, he is bringing in other Ministers.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: ..... did he talk to him to know the antecedents, the past antecedents of this firm before revising his order? That would be the proper thing to do. Probably, Shri Subramaniam has done that with honest intentions. I would like to know from him whether between these dates—and these dates are very important—28th June and 22nd July, specially between 19th July and 22nd July, he recollects having had any telephone talk with Shri Swaran Singh, his predecessor, and whether this interview was arranged through Shri Swaran Singh.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Sir, the name of another Minister is brought in.

Mr. Speaker: So far as I have been able to understand, the reference to Shri Swaran Singh has not been in a critical sense so far. He was simply saying that since Shri Swaran Singh came from Jullundur, where the firm was situated, whether any enquiries were made of him.

Shri D. C. Sharma: What does it matter if he belongs to Jullundur. There are many others who belong to Jullundur.

Mr. Speaker: He is only saying that the Minister could have enquired from his predecessor whether he knew this firm and what sort of firm it was.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy. To allay the suspicions of Professor Sharma I would further say that Shri Swaran Singh comes from Jullundur; this firm is also from Jullundur. Since 1952 the reputation, influence, name and fame of these two, Shri Swaran Singh and this particular firm, attained not only country-wide but international fame as well, and there must be reasons behind it. It must be known as to how it has happened.

Shri D. C. Sharma: The hon. Member is over-stepping his limits.

Mr. Speaker: I also feel that the hon. Member is over-stepping his limits. I would not allow the names of other Ministers to be brought in. This is beyond the scope of this discussion. I would not allow that. Now, impliedly he is saying that Shri Swaran Singh has a hand in it.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: If anybody challenges, I can prove it.

Mr. Speaker: No, I would not allow anything to be brought in here which implicates Shri Swaran Singh.

Shri D. C. Sharma: What does he mean by Shri Swaran Singh's name and fame?

Mr. Speaker: I too agree with Shri Sharma that the hon. Member has over-stepped his limits. This name should not be brought in.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Shri Subramaniam has stated in his statement that all this happened in between 1957 and 1960 and that he came in April 1962. Now, when he passed this order, may I enquire of him whether it occurred to him to enquire whether within these years, 1957—1960, out of court, out of all limitations, two licences or permits, one for Rs. 2½ crores for stainless steel and another for Rs. 1·10 crores were issued to Messrs. Aminchand Pyarelal and Messrs. Ramkrishen Kulwant Rai? Ordinarily when permits are given by the Iron and Steel Controller the report is not sent to the Ministry. All and sundry need not go to the Ministry. But these parties were getting so much by the grant of these licences, especially for stainless steel which was so scarce and on which one could made crores of rupees is it not a fact that the Iron and Steel Controller sent this file to the Minister saying "I am sending the file, as the Minister desires" and the Private Secretary wrote in the file "The Minister has seen; thank you"? Was it there or not, I would like to know. Did it occur to him that when such commitments were there, not during his tenure but during the tenure of his predecessor, he should take steps to find out the position?

Shri D. C. Sharma: So what?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Why are you so touchy?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member has taken 30 minutes. He should now conclude.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: So much of time was taken up by the interruptions.

Mr. Speaker: It is part of the game.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: If you rule like that, no discussion can take place.

Shri Ranga: There were disturbances on which so much time was taken.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: If we have to challenge his honesty, if we have to attribute any motives, if we have to say that he has done something improper or unjustified, we must place certain facts before the House. So, I am asking, between 16th Nov. 1962 and 23rd July was there any communication from the any higher-up to him. Was there any communication from the ex-Chief Minister of Punjab Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon, to the Minister regarding this affair? Is it not a fact, I now put it to him, that he issued a DO Letter No. NE.-Ind.7(24)/60, dated 29th March, 1963 in connection with the grant of import licences to Messrs. Aminchand Pyarelal group of industries? He wrote this letter and it has appeared in the correspondence that has been published as between this Minister and Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon, ex-Chief Minister of Punjab. What I want to say is this. This particular firm and this particular matter figured very prominently in the Das Commission Report. I have that report with me. It was made out by the petitioners before the Das Commission that one of the allegations against Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon was that through the help and asistance of this particular firm, by giving them licences and permits worth hundreds of crores of rupees, which were sold in the

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

blackmarket, he made money. This letter has been found in the correspondence that has passed between the Steel Minister and Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon.

It is very clear that some higher influence has worked on the Minister and, therefore, he has been obliged to change this order. This is a fact which can never be denied in the face of facts that we have in our possession.

Then a specious argument was put forward that a sinner will also have a future. He has mentioned in his evidence that every sinner should also have a future. If the sinner should have future then the Minister who has sinned must go; there is no other alternative.

I would like to say that he made the plea that because he wanted some industries to grow, therefore, he relaxed the order to enable them to put up some industries. That is a big hoax which, I am sure, other Members will show by their arguments. I am not going into the details.

श्री मधु लिमये : यह तो नियम के अनुसार बोल रहे हैं ।

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I will again appeal to you, to the House and to the judicial sense of Justice Chagla what he has said in the Mundhra inquiry. This matter is no less than what happened in the Mundhra case—the same considerations, the same reasons, the same facts, the same impropriety and the same irresponsibility.

Shri D. C. Sharma: But Feroze Gandhi is not here.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Justice Chagla there referred to the other aspect of the transaction which raises serious doubts as to its propriety and the haste with which it was effected." This is very appropriately the case here, the haste in which it was done. Between 20th and 22nd of July, the same night the order was passed and the Secretary goes on writing although the order passed on the 28th June actually was not issued till 31st July and the Minister did not bother even for a moment whether his order had been carried out, whether that had been issued or not.

Therefore, whatever the Public Accounts Committee might have said regarding the Minister that it is still obscure, I think, so far as I am concerned, the House will agree that the obscurity now goes. It has come to light why this was done. These facts were not placed before the Public Accounts Committee.

You do not permit me to speak about the other things. I have much material and I have on time; but I want to make it clear to you and to the House in the interest of this nation, that I have in my possession many facts implicating ministers, secretaries and officers regarding a firm which, I maintain, has made hundreds of crores or more. There is a company, Ironside Limited, U.K. biggest buyers of manganese and iron ore, and it will be worth while to refer all letters that the Reserve Bank has with them to the Bank of England to find out what a fraud has been committeed by this particular company. So far as that is concerned, recently in a case it has been shown, in the Bengal Co-operative Private Limited, controlled by one Onkar Jajoria. He has written a letter to George Cohen and Company, biggest firm in UK. This has been detected how this country's money was taken away by the firms and the country was cheated. The matter is under inquiry. Likewise, I would like that this should be inquired into so that the whole thing would be unearthed as to who were responsible. There is no doubt, the entire ministry, as I have said, and the officials are responsible for this.

So far as the Minister is concerned, the Public Accounts Committee's recommendation and decision is final and irrevocable. If this House wants

to maintain the traditions of parliamentary democracy, it must accept it as final. here is no question, regarding this particular matter, of any inquiry. Other matters may go to the inquiry as has been suggested by the Fiftieth Report. A thorough probe should held. When you hold the inquiry, it will be again necessary that the ministers concerned should be included and the ministers should resign, the officers concerned should be suspended and all business dealings with this particular group of firms should be suspended. Then alone the inquiry would be worth while. But let this House give all honour and credit to our P.A.C. We have all parties in it; we have elected them. They are our representatives and they have done this thankless job as our representatives and on our behalf. We accept them as such and, therefore, Government should also accept. There should be no hesitation; there should be no prevarication. It should not be sent to a legal authority. Who is the legal authority to go into the decision of a parliamentary committee, consisting of all parties? They have come to this finding after the good assistance of the Auditor General. The Public Accounts Committee comes into the picture or confines itself only to the audit remarks. One does not know what further material is there. So far as this minister is concerned, in one in the sea of the material he has been found guilty. If any conscience is left with him, he should not put anybody in embarrassment and should resign immediately. This matter should not go to a judicial inquiry. It should be taken as final and he should resign and other matters should go for a thorough probe.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I want to submit very respectfully that I have listened very respectfully to the speech of the hon. Member and he has said that other ministers, secretaries and officers are involved. He has extended very muh the scope of this debate. He has cast the net wider than you and we expected him to cast. How are those ministers, secretaires and officers whom he has held guilty, if I can use that word, by implication or insinuation, to be judged here? I think, it is something which is not right and proper.

Mr. Speaker: What he said was that the conclusions of the Fifty-fifth Report should not go to any judicial body but, as was recommended by the PAC, a high-power commission or commission of inquiry or something might be appointed to go into a thorough probe. He also endorses that, that that might be done.

Motion moved:

> "That the Fifty-fifth Report of the Public Accounts Committee on the statement made on the 18th May, 1966, in the House by the Minister of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation relating to para 4.123 of the Fftieth Report of the said Committee, presented to the House on the 5th August, 1966, be taken into consideration."

Time allotted is 5 hours to be finished this very day. That is the decision. We may have to sit late to finish it and conclude it but not carry it over.

Again, we come to the question of time-limit.

Shri Daji: That will be judged by you.

Mr. Speaker: 15 minutes each?

Shri Ranga: I cannot very well do in 15 minutes.

Shri Warrior (Trichur): If one person has got sufficient facts to present for 30 minutes, he must be given time.

Shri Daji: You can judge for yourself.

Shri Warrior: If I have 15 minutes and I repeat the very same thing, what is the use of it?

Shri Daji: At least 20 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: If some hon. Member is making new points, certainly he will be given some time, So, 15 minutes normally.....

Shri Ranga: I cannot take part in the debate. I am the only person who has got to speak for my party and I can not place myself at the mercy of 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Ranga should at least listen to me.

Shri Ranga: He has made this suggestion and at the same time you are repeating it.

Mr. Speaker: 15 minutes would be in the ordinary course, but if some hon. Member is making out new points, I have already said....

Shri Ranga: That leaves so much discretion. The other day I was making a speech on the non-official Resolution moved by Shri Surendranath Dwivedy and if you were to consult your records, you will find how I was treated by the Chair then. I do not want to place myself at the mercy of the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: That he has to place himself. I cannot help it.

About the substitute motions, I will again repeat my request, though again demands are being made, that it would not be worth while or advisable to press them, to move them and have a division on them. That would not be good also. I therefore entreat that Members should reconsider it and not press it.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: You should also consider our point of view.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Members may at present be permitted to move them and depending upon the response of the Government, later on after the discussion is over and if the Leader of the House accepts the commission of inquiry, we may with draw—not now but after the discussion is over.

Shri Tyagi: In this connection, about these substitute motions, may I submit one thing? In 1933, in the Central Assembly, the people's representatives insited on having a discussion on the Public Accounts Committee Report and the decision given by the Chair was like this:

> "In this particular case, the Chair might explain to the hon. Members that the usual parliamentary practice, when a motion to take into consideration the Public Accounts Report is made, is that no question is put after discussion. The motion that the Report of the Public Accounts Committee be taken into consideration is simply made with a view to giving an opportunity to the House to have a full and thorough discussion on the points arising out of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee."

I want to submit only one word more. As Chairman, I have seen the Public Accounts Committee decisions. They all rise above party considerations, they take decisions on matters of public money involved and there are no party affiliations in the Public Accounts Committee. Their unanimous reports are there. If, in this House, voting is to take place on party lines, that will embarrass those who have once voted on one side and then go to vote on party lines. Therefore, in the interest of those Members, I would request you to rule that there will be no substitute motions and putting the question to the House.

Some hon. Members *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: No discussion should be carried on in this matter.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): I would very briefly submit to you that the Opposition might be permitted to reconsider this matter of putting substitute motions or putting the question after the discussion because it is equally in the interest of the Opposition as it is in the interest of the Congress Party to preserve the position that the P.A.C. occupies today. If it

is subjected to the vagaries of political decisions, either today or tomorrow, it is possible that the force of the Public Accounts Committee and its observations would be drained of its vitality and of its unquestionable character. I think, in this view of the matter, in view of the discussion that has taken place already and in view of the hope that we still entertain that the Government would respond in an appropriate manner to the discussion in the House, the substitute motions should not be put to vote, though they may be moved at this stage.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: The Leader of the House wants to say something.

The Minister of Railways (Shri S. K. Patil): May I submit one thing before that is made? I do not take part in these disussions and, therefore, I am not killing the time of the House.

Sir, you have limited the scope of the discussion of this motion. It only refers to the 55th Report of the Public Accounts Committee. Now, what my hon. friend, Mr. Kamath is asking is to make a statement on something that arises out of the 50th Report of the Public Accounts Committee. I want a clarification from you that when that is made and the Government attitude is known, that should not be taken up again on the ground that that motion is made during this debate and, therefore anybody is entitled to refer to it. That will go far beyond the scope of the discussion of the 55th Report which you have already laid down. It was pointed out that such a commitment was made by the Steel Minister on the 12th. At the and of the discussion, even the Prime Minister would be pleased to say if it is so. But, if it is not, if it is going to be that because that statement is made, therefore, that again becomes a point in order for discussion, then that, according to your previous decision, is going far beyond the scope of this particular discussion.

Mr. Speaker: It would be better if it is made at the end then.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: As you like, Sir. I am in your hands.

Mr. Speaker: If the House wants. I can ask him to make that statement at the end.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Subtitute motions may be allowed to be moved now and depending upon the response later we can consider their withdrawal.

Mr. Speaker: The scope of the discussion has been prescribed, limited, confined and defined also. Therefore, the simple moving of the substitute motions would not make any difference in that.

Shri Hem Barua (Kauhati): When you allow a discussion on a particular subject, it is not good to set a precedent for narrowing its scope.

Mr. Speaker: That is done. I am clear in my mind that I must have done it, and I have done it. There is no going back on that.

Provisionally, I will allow them to be moved. But the ultimate decision will lie with the House.

Shri Tyagi: The House may decide in advance in what way it will discuss the Public Accounts Committee's Report.

Mr. Speaker: Now, I am really in this predicament, I am not clear in my mind, whether really at this moment I can ask the Hause to throw out the substitue motions. I must be sure before I can bar them out. Of course, the ultimate decision lies with the House, whether to accept it or to reject it. But whether at this moment the House can exercise any discretion, I am doubtful of that. Therefore, I am not taking that course. Tentatively, I allow these substitute motions to be moved.

श्री मधु लिमये : मौशंज पढ़ी जाएं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : कोई जरूरत नहीं है ।

Shri Parashar (Shivpuri): Sir, you have not finally admitted these substitute motions. You have said that they are moved tentatively. Kindly allow me to say a few words.

Sir, it is a special occasion and, therefore, a special procedure will have to be adopted. Once you admit the motion, it will be impossible for you as well as for the House to bar any discussion about that. Therefore, it should be clearly understood at the beginning that the discussion will be confined only to the motion and not to the substitute motions. And if this discussion is not to extend to the substitute motions, then what is the use of moving them. Therefore, under the guise of only moving them, this should not be taken as a liberty later on to say anything about them.

Mr. Speaker: No liberty would be taken in that respect. The scope of the discussion has been prescribed and all are agreed on that. That has been agreed to by the House. There is no going back on that.

Shri Hem Barua: May I submit that corruption is the worst form of violence? (*Interruption*). You are trying to narrow down the scope of the discussion on this.

Mr. Speaker: That I have done.

Shri Madhu Limaye: I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having taken into consideration the 55th report of the Public Accounts Committee, thanks the Public Accounts Committee and its Chairman for the splendid work they have done and expresses its approval of the Report." (1)

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having considered the 55th report of the Public Accounts Committee recommends to Government that a Commission headed by a Supreme Court Judge be appointed to investigate into the whole deal." (2)

Shri Daji: I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House having considered the 55th Report of the Public Accounts Committee records the appreciation of the work of the Committee and recommends that a Commission of Inquiry under the Commission of Inquiry Act, headed by a Supreme Court Judge be appointed, to investigate and report about the Barter deals referred to in the 50th Report of the Public Accounts Committee and the orders passed about the blacklisting of the firms of the group of M/s. Aminchand Pyarelal and into the working of all the companies of that Group."

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I beg to move:

That for the orignal motion, the following be substituted, namely:—

"This House, having taken into consideration the 55th Report of the Public Accodnts Committee, places on record its appreciation of the service rendered by the Committee in the nationa' interest, and to maintain the highest standards of integrity in administration. The House urges Government to appoint immediate'y a Commission of Inquiry under the Commissions of Inquiry Act, 1952 to inquire into the whole affair." (4).

Shri K. C. Pant: I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substitute, namely:—

"This House having considered the 55th Report of Public Accounts Committee notes with satisfaction Government's decision to appoint a high-level Committee to enquire into all

the matters referred to in the 50th Report of the Public Accounts Committee some of which have been further commented upon in the 55th Report, and endorses Government's stand." (5)

Shri S. M. Banerjee; Sir, I rise on a point of order.

This substitute motion of Shri K. C. Pant cannot be moved.

Mr. Speaker: That I will see. This is subject to its admissibility.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: This cannot be moved even.

Mr. Speaker: I will see that. (*Interruptions*). Order, order. I am saying again and again that subject to its admissibility, I allow it.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Even at this stage it cannot be moved.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalapuzha): Since there is a reference to the 50th Report in that substitute motion, Members may speak on the 50th Report.

Mr. Speaker: I will not allow that.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: If this is moved, we will speak on the 50th Report also . . . (*Interruptions.*)

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Kindly bear with me just for half a minute. My submission is only this. This substitute motion of Shri K. C. Pant makes a mention of the 50th Report. If you allow this to be moved, there are two things, firstly, that this will entail a full discussion on the 50th Report and the second thing is this that it says about the Government's decision to appoint a high-level Committee to enquire into all the matters when no such decision has been taken. This is utter stupidity.

Mr. Speaker: I will consider that also.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री अध्यक्ष महोदय, जैसा कि श्री बनर्जी ने अभी कहा है, माननीय सदस्य, श्री कृष्णचन्द्र पन्त, का संशोधन इस दृष्टि से अधिकांश है कि गवर्नमेंट ने अपनी ओर से अभी कोई निर्णय नहीं लिया है। दूसरे, श्री कृष्णचन्द्र पन्त ने अपने संशोधन में कहा है : "यह सभा, लोक-लेखा समिति के 55वें प्रतिवेदन पर विचार करने के पश्चात, लोक-लेखा समिति के 50वें प्रतिवेदन में उल्लिखित उन सभी मामलों का, जिन में से कुछ का उल्लेख 55वें प्रतिवेदन में भी किया गया है, जांच करने के लिए . . . ." आदि। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि "उन सभी मामलों" में केवल स्टील मिनिस्ट्री ही नहीं आयेगी बल्कि समिति के 50वें प्रतिवेदन में कामर्स मिनिस्ट्री भी आ जायेगी और सरकार को उस को भी जांच करानी पड़ेगी। इसलिए उन का यह संशोधन निर्मित नहीं है।

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: There seems to have been some sort of colusion between the Treasury Benches and Mr. Pant because he anticipated, perhaps he was told, that Government's decision would be coming earlier in the day and, therefore, the decision is referred to in his motion. And then also the 50th Report . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. We shall see these objections and then decide.

Mr. Daji.

Shri Daji: I rise to indict Mr. Subramaniam for acting without adequate reasons and for reasons which are far from *bona fide*, leading to condoning of felonious acts, using discretion indiscreetly with carelessness which can be called culpable carelessness, showing lack of competent judgment. I further indict him for incredible credibility about the deliberate delays in the office of the Iron & Steel Controller amounting to, in the words fo Justice Chagla, acquiescence in the dereliction of the officers. I further indict him for prevarications to cover up his tracks and to attempt

[Shri Daji.]

at circumventing the functions of the PAC.

14.23 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

My indictment is based on the 55th Report of the PAC, which has only reiterated its findings in the 50th Report.

Before I come to the main points, a hurried look at the entire background is called for.

The first order in these transactions was passed on the 16th November, 1962 by Mr. Subramaniam himself. Please note that, so that, when we later on discuss his forgiveness to the sinner, we must know that he knew the nature of the sin. When he passed that order, in the notes Mr. Subramaniam has noted that this group of firms has been trying to hoodwink the Government and, therefore, they should be blacklisted. Then certainly irregular transactions regarding the disposal of imported rounds came to the notice of the Department for which the Secretary put up a note saying that two years' suspension of business by Iron and Steel Controller would meet the requirements of the case. On this Mr. Subramaniam has said, 'No'; he disagreed and then wrote that it should be a general order, so that the other government departments and institutions also do not deal with these firms. It is this order, which has been held to be specific, complete and final, that was communicated by the Secretary in clear and categorical terms, in terms given on page 4 of the PAC's report, to the Iron and Steel Controller. The terms of the order are:

> "The matter has been examined and it has been decided that business dealings should be suspended with M/s. Surendra Overseas and its associated concerns for a period of two years with immediate effect. A general order may please be issued immediately under the black-listing code, so that other Government Departments and Government Institutions may also not deal with these firms for a period specified above. A copy of the order may please be sent to me as soon as it is issued."

Mark the word 'immediately' in "A general order may please be issued immediately under the black-listing code, so that other Government Departments . . .".

When these orders were conveyed to the Iron and Steel Controller's office, there were back references. The first back reference was on 6th July and the query was whether this order should apply to all the concerns of the group or only to the trading concerns and whether industrial concerns also should be included or not. The matter was again examined and on the 12th July, another order was passed reiterating the old order but exempting only two rolling mills of the group. Thereafter, a second back reference was made on 17th July by the same office, by the Iron and Steel Controller, saying that the Transport Ministry should be consulted because one concern, namely, Apeejay Lines, was a transport line. This letter of 17th July has been very sharply noted by the PAC. It has said that this letter should, in the normal course, have reached the office of the Secretary and the Minister on 18th or 19th, but somehow it did not reach. In between, Mr. Jit Paul met the Minister which led to the revision of the order of 23rd June and this revision of the order virtually restored the *status quo* as it existed on 16th November 1963. This is a very fast resume so that when we deal with the matter in question, we may know the background of it.

Then I think I need not take much of the time of the House in going into the background of the companies with which we are dealing. The Public Accounts Committee, in its Annexure, has given a list of offences starting

from 1954 when it was first blacklisted and how subsequently when the blacklisting was relaxed, the company again and again went on defaulting taking advantage of that, taking special favour, to the tune of lakhs and lakhs of rupees. For example, I will point out one pointed transaction to the House in which the company benefited to the tune of Rs. 15 lakhs. When the steel prices in the internal market had fallen, it was still allowed the same old price which had been contracted long back and for which they had defaulted. First of all there was a contract and secondly there was a default. When the steel price fell in the international market, then the default was condoned and the contract was again revalidated and the price was the old price. In this one transaction alone, there was a loss to the tune of Rs. 15 lakhs. This is in the 34th Report of the Committee. I am pointing out only one transaction because I have no time to go into all the transactions. It will suffice to say that the record is a record of shameful partiality, favours shown, gross illegalities, irregularities and smuggling condoned—smuggling condoned—corrupt collusion of officers of Iron and Steel Controller and the Ministry, directives of the Finance Ministry and the Steel Ministry circumvented and flouted and exchequer defrauded. The Committee has remarked that they were given almost a free run of the land with complete impunity; they took the Iron and Steel Controller's office and the Ministry for granted. Here is a picture not of a Board trying to build our country in our own way, whether I may like free enterprise or not; but here is a picture of corrupt, blooded and bleeding free enterprise, capitalist enterprise in this naked form. It is only sometimes that we in this House and the country get a peep behind the silken robes of the private sector. When we see the picture, it is the worst in the public sector. Even Mr. Masani will bear me out. It was with such frandulent Companies that the Minister was dealing. This must be kept in mind.

Over a period of six years, they were given import licences for Rs. 29 crores. It was Rs. 29 crores. Suddenly in 1959 their quota in the total export-import trade rose from 9 per cent to 60 per cent of all the licences issued; whereas in 1958-59 their quota was only 9 per cent, in 1959 their quota rose to 60 per cent of all the licences issued—almost a monopoly, virtually monopoly. It was with these firms that the Minister was dealing. We must, therefore, realise this background. It was in this background that the matter came up for those imported rounds missing. The Minister rightly took the stand that mere suspension of business of iron and steel would not do and that it should be blacklisted for all government departments because limited blacklisting had been practised in 1954—Kaka Sahib Gadgil's was the first order—and it had failed to give any effect. Therefore, the Minister's second order was the proper order. But then, what happened? Then, some things happened, some things which are inexplicable, according to me, some things, the reasons for which are obscure, according to the Public Accounts Committee, and the Minister charged his roder. The Public Accounts Committee had only remarked:

> "The Sub-committee are unable to understand the circumstances under which the Minister changed his previous orders.".

Why did the Minister change his orders? The secretary to the Ministry was asked a pointed question:

> "Why did the Minister change the orders?".

The secretary's reply on record is:

> "I cannot answer what made the Minister to do so.".

In the face of this, I submit that there was no alternative for the Public Accounts Committee but to come to this conclusion, and in this conclusion

[Shri Daji]

also, 'the Public Accounts Committee, if it has erred, has rightly erred on the side of leniency. The committee's only remarks are:

"We are unable to understand.".

Shri C. Subramaniam comes and says that he is surprised at this finding of the Public Accounts Committee. He is surprised. I have dealt with the question of surprise in detail, and the Hon. Speaker has also said that surprise meant a reprobation of the committee. So, I do not want to repeat it. But I might recall an English humour. A professor of English literature was one day caught red-handed by his wife, while he was kissing the maid. Thereupon the wife said, 'John, I am surprised.'. But like all irate professors of English he turned round and said 'Mary, how is it that even after fifteen years of association with me, you still speak incorrect English? You are shocked; I am surprised.'. It was in this context that Shri C. Subramaniam was surprised. Caught by the Public Accounts Committee in the stance of a clandestine kiss with this firm of Amirchand Pyarelals, Shri C. Subramaniam says that he is surprised. Yes, he was surprised; so is the nation and so is this House shocked at the frifolous way in which Ministers can deal with their files and condone the action of such swindlers.

I submit that Shri C. Subramaniam has tried to present the wrong end of the picture to us. The approach should not be whether the action was *mala fide* or not. That is the burden of Shri C. Subramaniam's song in the House and before the Public Accounts Committee. The approach should be whether the action was *bona fide*. It has nowhere been held that a Minister is free of guilt till positive *mala fides* are proved. No one caught Shri T. T. Krishnamachari red-handed taking a bribe from Mr. Mundhra, nor was Shri H. M. Patel caught red-handed while taking a bribe from Mundhra and yet both had to go. They had to go not because they had taken bribe but because their action showed undue haste and acquiescence in certain shady deals and transactions and impropriety. Therefore, my submission is that the approach of the House and of the Government should be not whether Shri C. Subramaniam's action is *mala fide* or not but whether it is *bona fide*. Here, I submit that after his having first over-ruled the secretary's suggestion of a limited blacklisting order, having first passed the order, an all-covering order and having then changed this order, the burden lies squarely on Shri C. Subramaniam to justify the change of order, and it is not for me to show that the change was not justified. This approach must be borne in mind, because it was he who had insisted upon a wider order, and it was again he who within a matter of days changed his order. When such quick work is there, when such fast work is there, fast in the very proper English sense of the word, a little too fast, when such too fast orders are there, the burden is on the Minister, and the House should consider whether the Minister has discharged that burden. Shri C. Subramaniam has advanced two reasons.

Dr. M. S. Aney: Does my hon. friend want to maintain that the absence of *bona fide* should be taken as *mala fide*?

Shri Daji: If the circumstances are such that the *bona fides* of the actions are shrouded in doubts, then they are tantamount to *mala fide* actions.

Shri C. Subramaniam has put forward two explanations or two reasons, and I shall examine each of them separately. The first of these two explanations is the Transport Ministry's assessment. I am using Shri C. Subramaniam's own words. The Transport Ministry's assessment is the first reason. Jit Paul's apology is the second. But before I examine these two reasons, may I submit that Shri C. Subramaniam is not clear in his mind which of the two reasons

ultimately tilted the scale, or he is prevaricating? It is like Shri C Subramaniam coming before the House like a criminal who can take contradictory, different and diversified stands and then rest content on the burden of proof not having been discharged by the prosecution and then say 'Give me the benefit of doubt'. I submit that this is not a criminal trial. Shri C. Subramaniam must squarely and convincingly spell out the reasons or else he falls.

When he first made a statement on the 18th May before this House, what was the tenor of that statement? The tenor of that statement was that the most important factor was the assessment of the Transport Ministry. It was not only that, but he tried to give an impression to the House that though Mr. Jit Paul had seen him and had tendered an apology to him, he was not in a mood and was not prepared to accept that apology. That was the tenor of Shri C. Subramaniam's that this is not a criminal trial. I shall read out from his own statement. He had stated:

> "Meanwhile, on the 29th July, 1963, one of the representatives of this firm, Mr. Jit Paul, sought and had an interview with me. I took strong objection to the activities of his concerns and advised him . . .".

—mark the words 'I took strong objection to the activities of his concerns'—

> " . . and advised him that it would be better that his firm concentrated activity on productive industrial enterprises rather than on trade.".

Why did he advise him in that manner? Did we appoint Shri C. Subramaniam as the Minister for Steel to advise private parties to start industrial activities or did we appoint him to guard our exchequer? Anyway, at least he took serious objection. Then, what did he do? He says:

> "The representative apologised for what might have been mistakes on their part...".

Then, he quotes a letter from the firm. That letter is well known to the House and I need not take the time of the House in reading it out. Then, please note what statement he made before the House. He says:

> 'On full consideration, I decided that there was no case for conceding the request of the firm to be permitted to have dealings with the Iron and Steel Controller...'.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should try to conclude now.

Shri Daji: I have just begun my speech.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let him try to finish.

Shri Daji: I am only trying to give the whole picture in a cogent way.

Shri Ranga: That was why I had warned my hon. friend that he should not place himself at the mercy of these people.

Shri Daji: He has clearly stated:

> "On full consideration, I decided that there was no case for conceding the request...".

Then he has said:

> 'In view of the assessment of the Transport Ministry, however...'—mark the word 'however'—
>
> "...I decided to reconsider...".

On full consideration, Shri C. Subramaniam decided not to concede, but however, in view of the assessment of the Transport Ministry, he decided to reconsider. He says:

> "In view of the assessment of the Transport Ministry, however, I decided to reconsider the decision in regard to application of the suspension order to dealings with other Ministries.".

So, the first version is the apology by the firm, and the second is the assess-

[Shri Daji]

ment of the Transport Ministry. First, the letter from the firm is quoted and it is said that he took strong objection to a consideration of the matter and he thought that it was not proper to accede to the request in that letter, but, however, in view of the assessment of the Transport Ministry, he decided to revise the order in its applicability to other Ministries; this was what he stated in his statement before the House. It was not only that, but he further said:

> 'I would like to reiterate that it shou'd be remembered that it was I who initiated proceedings against the concern and suspended all transactions between my Ministry and the concern.'.

He wants, therefore, to take further credit. It was not only that, but he then went before the Public Accounts Committee and made some statement. Now, there is a difference between appearing before the Public Accounts Committee and appearing here. Here, he can make a statement based on sentiments and get away with it. But before the Public Accounts Committee he had to face a cross-examination. There, he entirely shifted his stand.

Shri C. Subramaniam said before the Public Accounts Committee as follows:

> "There were reasons in my opinion for reconsidering it... It is in that connection that the letter dated July 22nd written by one of the directors of the company is important...Therefore, it is on the basis of this that I took a decision, as they say, every sinner has a future because he frankly admitted the failings he had committed and also gave the assurance of good conduct in the future.... Therefore, this is the basis for the variation of that order. So, it cannot be said there was no reason for this variation.".

This was his statement before the Public Accounts Committee, when he appeared before them. Here, the entire basis is shifted from the assessment of the Ministry to the letter. I am examining the two reasons given by Shri C. Subramaniam in order to show how he has been prevericating between these two reasons themselves. Let me now examine the first reason in detail, namely the assessment made by the Transport Ministry.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member should try to conclude now. He has already taken about 20 minutes.

Shri Daji: I cannot help it. If justice has to be done to my poin s, I must be given some more time. I am taking the points one by one, and I am not taking even a single minute more than is necessary; I am not using adjectives at all but I am only analyzing the conduct of the Minister. I shall take another 15 minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then, he will be cutting into the time of the other Members.

Shri Daji: I cannot do justice to this in such a short time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has already taken about 20 minutes.

Shri Daji: I cannot help it.

What is the assessment? No letter. Only a telephone call from a Deputy Secretary in the Iron and Stee' Ministry to another Deputy Secretary in the Transport Ministry. 'Hello. what do you know of Apeejay Ltd?' 'It is a very very good firm'. That is all. Do you mean to say that Shri Subramaniam relied upon such a vague, nebulous, incoherent assessment of the Transport Ministry?

An hon. Member: Nothing in writing?

Shri Daji: No, only a telephone conversation. The noting by the Deputy

Secretary of his Ministry is that he had a talk with the Deputy Secretary in the other Ministry.

Now, supposing the Transport Ministry gave a clear clearance to Apeejay Ltd., a transport company, I would like to put one question. What relevance has the clearance by the Transport Ministry of one company to changing an order from suspension of dealings with all departments of Government to one confining the suspension to the Iron and Steel Controller's organisation? Is there any nexus between the two, is there any logical connection between the two? The Public Accounts Committee have very cleverly mentioned this and said 'We have never questioned the exemption of Apeejay Ltd. What we question is the exemption of all departments'. How could the assessment of the Transport Ministry be at all relevant to variation of orders from all government departments only the Iron and Steel Controller's office? That cannot be explained.

Again, I will draw attention to the culpable, careless remark of Shri Subramaniam and his department. Apeejay is not only a shipping line. It is itself an importer, a defaulting importer against which an inquiry by SPE is pending, against which defalcation charges are pending, a firm which had been blacklisted, against which there is a charge of smuggling —this is Apeejay Limited. And to exempt this firm, he relied upon the assessment of the Transport Ministry and in the process he exempted from the suspension all firms of the entire group in respect of all departments. Is there any nexus? Is this a valid reason? Therefore, I say this reason need not be gone into. It can be dismissed. There might be another set of reasons.

Then the apology. What is this apology? I would like to quote from the letter of Shri Jit Paul, because it is very illuminating:

> "I appreciate your remark that some of my transactions in the Trade in the past have not been to your satisfaction. I admit that there have ben mistakes.."—

Smuggling is a mistake! Fraud is a mistake!—This is the apology. And this Shri Subramaniam regards as a full apology, of a firm charged with smuggling, charged with defalcation, a firm which not only fooled the Department of Iron and Steel Controller but was caught red-handed, having made a declaration of a lesser number of bales going out but the bales being discovered on surprise checking, a firm which was guilty of a criminal action. All this is dismissed as mistakes.

And what are the 'mistakes on my part'?

> "But they were mostly due to the circumstances then prevailing—"

Did Shri Subramaniam ask Shri Jit Paul what were the circumstances? Were the circumstances a favourable Minister or favourable Secretary or a favourable Iron and Steel Controller? Or were these the circumstances, that during that time 'I could do as I wanted'. Surely this letter of apology is a great slur on his Ministry, a slur on the Government. They have accepted this as a letter of apology.

Then, if this apology is important, why was the fact of this apology not mentioned in the first hearing by the Secretary before the Committee, because this apology had been discussed by Shri Subramaniam with the Secretary? The Secretary had noted on the same page. I referred to it when I mentioned about it last time. The Secretary was giving evidence before the Committee. When the Committee asked him about it, he said, 'I do not know'. Why was this apology completely absent from the evidence? Why was this apology under-played by Shri Subramaniam himself before the House on the 18th May? Why this misdirection, this prevarication on Shri Subramaniam's part. When the Committee asked Shri Subramaniam whe-

[SHRI DAJI]

ther someone else was present at the interview with Shri Jit Paul, he should have said 'No'. But he says, 'I do not remember'. The Committee was not asking whether a chaprasi was present. The purport of the question was whether some important person was present. I would have asked whether a Chief Minister was present, whether a Cabinet coleague was present, whether an influential member of the Party was present. Was the presence of anyone else then so inconsequential that Shri Subramaniam forgot about it or was it so consequential that he could not say 'No'? This is a suspicious fact surrounding this circumstance.

This is not all. He was further asked a very important question by the Committee. 'Did it not strike you when Shri Jit Paul came to you, as to why he came to you and how he came to know that such an order was considered, because this is a confidential order?' What does Shri Subramaniam say? Look at his arrogance before the Committee:

> "I did not cross-examine him on that point".

If I am a Minister and if a man comes to me for such a purpose, the first question I would put to him is, 'How did you come to know that a blacklisting order is in contemplation?' He did not ask any such question to the representative of a firm which had defaulted before, but he straightway tells the Committee:

> "I did not cross-examine him on that point".

This is his arrogance before the Committee.

Lastly, why did he accept the apology? Now I come to the reason given by Shri Subramaniam for accepting the apology. He says 'Every sinner has a future'. Did Shri Subramaniam know that while 'every sinner has a future', this was not his first sin? Was he not aware of his own order of 16th November against this firm? Was he oblivious of the recommendation of the PAC in their 34th Report? Was he not aware of the smuggling charge against the firm, the criminal action of the firm and defalcation of HSL The Committee put him this question whether he had not passed an order on the 16th November against this firm as it had been hoodwinking Government, and Shri Subramaniam had the check to tell the Committee, 'I do not know whether anything against him existed'.

I therefore submit that this apology cannot be the reason. And he did not stop there. Shri Subramaniam has treaded on most dangerous paths. He gives advice to the Committee, The Committee should consider not whether there was justification for the reconsideration of the order but only whether there were reasons for me, in my opinion, to reconsider it'. Then he says, 'It cannot be said that there were no reasons for the variation'.

I submit this is truncating the Public Accounts Committee. The Committee was well within its powers to examine the justification of the reasons. Supposing Shri Subramaniam had gone before the Committee and said, 'I reconsidered the order because a Cabinet colleague of mine got one lakh of rupees as election fund from him', does he really mean that that reason could not be examined by the Committee? Does he mean to suggest that if he had said before the Committee, 'A Chief Minister had recommended it. Therefore, I had to do it', the Committee could not go into it? Does he, again, mean to say that if he had deposed before the Committee that 'he got a crore of rupees as election fund and therefore he reconsidered the order, the Committee is precluded from going into it? Does he mean to contend that the Committee is pervented from looking into the sufficiency or otherwise of the reason?

Now, what is the culpability about it? Because of his reconsideration of

the order, this firm continued on the rampage. Let him read the latest report of the Public Undertaking Committee which details how this firm has cheated the ONGC in a pipe deal concluded after this order. Let Shri Satya Narayan Sinha take note that this firm has invaded his Post and Telegraph Department. Let Shri Chavan note from para 26 of the 1966 Audit Report that this company has invaded the Defence Department. Let the Oil Ministry take note that the ONGC has been cheated by this firm.

This is the result of this reconsideration of the order of total suspension of dealings. If 'sinners' have a future, then this will be the future which they will try to exploit. This is criminal culpability.

15 hrs.

Therefore, this criminal culpability cannot be excused, this callousness cannot be condoned, this well-established sin cannot be pardoned. If the Minister used his discretion, he has used it in an indiscreet manner, he has shown complete lack of competent judgment, he has displayed complete lack of background information which shows that at the relevant he forget that he had passed an earlier order on the firm, and thinks this is the first time he is pasing an order; if all this happens as a result of which the sweat and toil of our poor people from whom we collect money is misused and if fortunes are allowed to be amassed by such swindlers and then if they are still to continue, I say India is not a land free for financial swindlers, nor should the Government be turned into a swindlers' den. If such incompetent, grossly incompetent Ministers who condone irregularities are allowed to rule our country, the conclusion will be that not only the swindlers are swindling, but the Government, or the Minister concerned, is conniving at it acquiesing in it. It is with this indictment that I charge. Therefore, I say the circumstances surrounding the decision reveal the utmost credibility, culpable carelessness, naivette, indiscretion, irresponsibility and a total lack of competent judgment which casts a doubt on the *bona fides* of the action. The action is shrouded in such doubts that such action I refuse to say is a *bona fide* action, and must be held to be *mala fide* in law. There is something called *mala fide* in law. It may not be *mala fide* in fact, but it is *mala fide* in law. This action is an action *mala fide* in law ,and not only Mr. Subramaniam but the whole, entire Government should resign out of propriety, it may be reconstituted without him, but such a scandal cannot be forgiven.

Aminchand Pyrelal was given Rs. 29 crores, but this very Public Accounts Committee has revealed that more than Rs.5 crores have been wasted on export promotion of art silk. The aspect of the matter we have all missed in this furore of Aminchand Pyarelal. Rs. 5 crores have been lost in an export promotion scheme on art silk. That also has to be examined. If such scandals are to be stopped, it should be stopped when we come across one. may be out of 100 cases we catch one, but in that one case strong action is called for, because whether it is *mala fide* in fact or not, *mala fide* in law has been more than proved.

Shri K.C. Pant: I beg to move substitute motion standing in my name:

That for the orginal motion, the following be substituted, namely: —

> "This House having considered the 55th Report of Public Accounts Committee notes with satisfaction Government's decision to appoint a high-level Committee to enquire into all the matters referred to in the 50th Report of the Public Accounts Committee some which have been further commented upon in the 55th Report and endorses Government's stand."

I would have been frankly much happier if the observations of the Speaker had evoked response from all sides of the House and all the substitute motions have been withdrawn.

[SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN]

However, since the others have not been withdrawn, I have no option but to move my substitute motion also

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: On a point of order. I have scanned the motion standing in his name. If I understood the Speaker aright, when we raised objections on this side of the House, the Speaker said he would consider very carefully the admissibility of the motions.

An hon. Members: Why are you intervening?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Why are you intervening? I am raising a point of order. He will decide that. Keep quiet.

The speaker said that he would consider the admissiblity of the motion before it could be moved. And the point raised was on two counts We found fault with this motion on two counts, it is defective on two grounds. One is it anticipates—I do not know. it is his own party's Gove nment I know, he might know what is going on inside the Government—some decision by Government.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All that has been said.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: No, Sir, he has not given a ruling

Shri Hari Vishnu KaKmath: You were not listening. you were not attentive, perhaps.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He will give a ruling.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We give notice here that if he moves that motion, we will take the opportunity to speak on the 50th report of the PAC; take notice, take note, do not stop us from speaking on the 50th Report.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He will give the decision.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I am sorry you are not understanding my point. You cannot stop Members. Have you read the motion? Please read it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has said all that. He will give a decision later.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The point is he has moved his motion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Admissibility of the motion will be considered later.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Once he has moved it, as you know under the rules, you are conversant with the rules of procedure of the House, everything that is said in the motion will be open for discussion. The 50th Report of the PAC referred to in the motion will be open to the House for discussion. You cannot stop us.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He need not refer to the amendment.

Shri S. K. Patil: I do not want to intervene, but if I remember, when these various motions were mentioned in the morning, the Speaker had not given the rulling. He said it was very difficult for him to rule one way on the other. He made an exhortation to the movers of motions that they should withdraw. Ultimately he said that the motions are there, I will take a decision later on. That does not preclude a Member from making a speech and referring to a motion. It is not moved or anything. That will await the final decision of the Speaker. Shri Pant was the first to get up and make a statement that he was prepared to withdraw his motion if others were going to withdraw. I think, therefore, this type of a thing does not arise. It should be left to the Speaker.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The 50th Report will be discussed, that is all. I am happy it is moved, because we will have the opportunity to discuss the 50th Report as well.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order,

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: What do you mean by "Order, order"; what is this "Order, "order"?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Speaker has said that he will give a decision later whether it is in order or not. So, Mr. Pant will speak on the main motion.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I rise on a point of order.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I am glad it is being moved, but you will have to permit the Members to speak on the 50th Report to which the motion refers, that is all I say.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He will not speak on the 50th Report.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: How can you stop?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He will not speak on the amendment also, he will speak on the main motion.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Does it mean that no other substitute motion will be moved?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All those have been moved, including Mr. Pants, but whether it is in order or not, the Speaker will consider and give a ruling later.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I rise on a point of order on the business of the House, under rule 376 (2).

In the morning, when the question of substitute motions came, the Speaker gave his advice to us.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House did not accept the advice.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Kindly hear me.

After his advice, we also considered the motion, then we argued, and then ultimately some people, including Mr Tyagi, wanted that the decision should be left to the House. The Speaker in his wisdom did not agree to this, and when this motion of Mr. Dwivedy was moved and he concluded his speech, he actually asked us by name whether we were moving our motions, right from Mr. Madhu Limaye to Mr. K. C. Pant, because his is the last one. When Mr. Pant said he was moving it, I rose on a point of order on two counts. One was that this deals with the 50th Report I would only request you to kindly read it. It reads:

> "This House having considered the 55th Report of Public Accounts Committee notes with satisfaction Government's decision to appoint a high-level Committee to enquire into all the matters referred to in the 50th Report of the Public Accounts Committee some of which have been further commented upon in the 55th Report, and endorses Government's stand."

My objection to this is, my point of order is this. Members are precluded—I can quote the rule—from raising a matter which is of an anticipatory nature in an amendment or a substitute motion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All these were heard by the Speaker.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I will tell you what the Speaker said. He said he would consider the admissibility, whether it is admissible or not. I request you to kindly consider this.

He has said, I beg to move, I wish to speak on my motion", if I correctly heard him. You can consult the record. If you have allowed him to move, then you cannot stop us, we shall discuss the 50th Report from top to bottom, and then anticipatory motions can also come, and our motions cannot be stopped. You should give a ruling on that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Speaker has heard all these arguments, and he has allowed all the amendments to be moved, but he has reserved his judgment whether it is in order or not That will be done at a later stage, and he had also ruled the scope of the discussion, that the 50th Report will not be discussed.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is all topsy turvy.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Pant will not refer to the 50th Report or his amendment, but will speak on the main motion.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The Speaker is in the chamber, you give a ruling.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You will speak only on the main motion.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: When motions have been moved, how can you stop Members from speaking on them? The Speaker never said that you could speak only on the main motion. I can challenge you here; let us get the record.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: How can you stop us? You cannot.

Shri Parashar: I hear the same thing what Mr. Kamath had heard. He cannot speak beyond the purport of the main resolution.

Shri K. C. Pant: Sir, I bow to your ruling and I shall confine myself to the 55th report and the main motion. However, there is one point which I would like to clarify with your permission. It has been said that this reference to the enquiry committee is wholly anticipatory. If the hon. Members had either paid attention to what Mr. Mathur said, they would have understood it was not Mr. T. N Singh in the course of a debate in the House on the 12th August made clear Government's intention that a high level enquiry would be set up. Therefore, there is good ground for saying this; it is not wholly anticipatory. In the same context, Mr. Singh had explained in reply to a question that it would cover all aspects of the matter. I do not want to go more into this.

The 55th report of the PAC which is before the House gives evidence of the diligence, care, and thoroughness with which it has been prepared. This is in keeping with the high standards maintaned by our praliamentary committees on one of which I too have the privilege to be a Member. Over the years the PAC and the Estimates Committee and, since its formation, the PUC have built up a reputation for alertness, dignity, tanatity and working hard without fear or favour. They work quietly outside the glare of publicity but this only serves to add to their effectiveness. In this particular case, the PAC has rendered a useful public service by pinpointing certain areas of malfunctioning in certain departments and suggested that there was sufficient evidence to call for a high level enquiry to go into the whole matter. This is not a party matter. I submit again, and we on this side are as anxious as our friends opposite that nothing should be swept under the carpet. If there has been a lapse, the responsibility for that should be fixed and due punishment should be rated out to the guilty. In fact we are in a sense even more anxious than friends opposite that the government machinery should function as well as possible because while there may be some temporary embarrassment to the government and our party when the malfunctioning of certain government departments or individuals in the government are brought to light, in the long run people will judge us by the performance of government as a whole. It is wholly in our interest and in the interest of the country that a sharp watch be kept on the sprawling machinery of government and any defects in it be removed as soon as they are spotted. It is not in the making of mistakes that the country will judge us; people will judge us by the response of the Government when these mistakes are pointed out. In this instance, the Government has done the right and proper thing by accepting the PAC Recommendation to hold a high level enquiry to which I referred earlier. In the light of this decision, there is no need to go into the individual cases dealt with by the report. It is unnecessary and perhaps not quite proper as well in the sense that once it is known that all these matters will be enquired into thoroughly it is better not to prejudge issues or prejudice their consideration in any way. It would be more purposeful and meaningful to discuss the findings of the enquiry committee when they become available.

It should be kept in mind that the PAC confines itself to the working of the governmental system and its failure if any. It examines government officers who are concerned with the

matters under discussion ex-officio and not the individuals who themselves took the decisions. The PAC is careful not to condemn individuals on the principle that no one is to be condemend without a hearing; it contents itself with recommending a further enquiry by an appropriate body which could where necessary probe into facts or take disciplinary or legal action against those who have failed in their duties.

This brings me to some of the larger issues thrown up by this discussion. First is the question of inter-relationship between this House, the PAC and the Government. Both the PAC and the Government are the creatures of Parliament. Membership of the PAC broadly reflects the various groups and shades of opinion here. Its recommendations are therefore entitled to full consideration and respect and healthy conventions of parliamentary democracy require that the Government should normally accept those recommendations. But I would, with all respect, remind those friends, who referred to this matter, that technically speaking the recommendations of the PAC, are not directions of the House and cannot therefore be held to be automatically binding on the executive. This is an important difference in principle. In other words, the final judgment on the implementation of the recommendations addressed to the Government has to be exercised by the Government. Then the question arises: how are differences between the Government and the PAC to be disposed of or resolved? Even when there are no differences how is the House take note of the reports? This was under discussion since morning and the Speaker dwelt on this point. The present practice is that the reports of these committees are commented upon during the debates on demands for grants; they are never discussed in the House. The right of Parliament to discuss these reports, as the Speaker pointed out, cannot be questioned. But the wisdom of holding such discussions is certainly open to doubt. In mid 1950s when differences arose between the PAC and the Government some Members wanted to discuss the matter in the House and the Speaker, Shri Mavalankar observed:

> 'It is no use having a discussion, here and making speeches as that will not help the growth of parliamentary democracy. We must evolve a better method and procedure rather than mere discussion and rankerous statements and arguments made in the House."

There are other rulings in the same vein but I will not take the time of the House with them. So, he asked for a better procedure to be evolved. It is interesting to note that in the 52nd report of the PAC, that is a report that came after the 50th and before the 55th report, the sub-committee observed as follows: "the sub-committee desires that a healthy convention should be developed whereby if there is any difficulty in implementing a recommendation reiterated by the committee, the matter should be submitted to the Cabinet and its decision communicated to the committee." The point to note here is that even in case of divergence of opinion between the Government and the PAC, neither the Speaker, nor the PAC itself considers a discussion in the House as being desirable. It is even less desirable when the Government accepts a recommendation of the PAC to probe into a particular matter and here I would like to underline the fact that the Government has accepted the recommendation in this case and thus there is no disagreement.

If the object of the discussion is to get the House approve or disapprove the report, it runs into various difficulties. First and foremost, if it is in order for the House to approve the report, it follows that it is open to the House to reject it. This may be the theoretically possible, but I am sure that no one here would like to leave any room for such a possibility to materialise. After all it should not be forgotten that the PAC functions as an

[Shri K. C. Pant]

expert, rather than a political body. The Party whip does not operate in the PAC as it does here. That is why the established practice since Independence is against discussing the PAC report in the House. This convention was repeatedly upheld by Shri Mavalankar and he said that if a situation arose in which discussion on the inevitable party lines exposes a PAC report to critical comments, it would not be proper. Even leaders of the Opposition like Shri Surendranath Dwivedy and Shrimati Renu Chakravartty pointed out at an earlier stage that it was against the present practice of the House to discuss PAC reports. You, in your wisdom had made an exception to day but I do hope that this would remain the solitary exception. For reasons I have just referred to at some length, discussions on PAC reports in the House are fraught with difficulties.

Another wider issue that has been thrown up is how should complaints against Ministers and officials be dealt with. It is necessary to evolve clear-cut procedures. It is as necessary to protect the innocent as to punish the guilty. Committed as we are to socialism, the role of the State in the life of the community will keep on increasing. The government apparatus is already large; it will get larger. Even today, we complaint of inaction or slow action on the part of the Government machinery. Let us not give quarter to the dishonest, but let us at the same time be careful not to create an atmosphere in which no distinction is made between dishonesty and honest mistake. Otherwise, everyone in the administration will pass the buck and seek horizontal and vertical support. Let us accept that some decisions will be wrong. Some percentage of error is always there. The crucial question is, is it *bona fide* or *mala fide* error? The protection of the innocent should be as much the responsibility of this august House as the punishment of the guilty.

The Santhanam Committee has dealt with the question of dealing with complaints against Ministers and officials. The principles enunciated by this Committee have found a large measure of support on both sides of the House. It makes a distinction between the handling of complaints against Ministers and officials. It suggests one procedure for examining complaints against officials and another for examining compaints against Ministers. I am here concerned with the principle underlying the difference in procedures rather than their merits. While a civil servant is entitled to insist on the protection offered by his conduct rules and while he can continue to function until he is found guilty, a Minister cannot function under a cloud. This point has been made by friends opposite. But the point is, who is to decide? The going out of a Minister is something which the Prime Minister alone can decide. The judgment of the Prime Minister in this matter is crucial, and I think we can be quite sure that no Prime Minister of this country, or no Prime Minister under any democratic system, can afford to keep a Minister who has lost public confidence. But the decision rests with her and her alone so long as she continues to remain Prime Minister.

Here, I want to touch on the limited point as to whether or not a separate formal enquiry should be set up against Shri Subramaniam. I am not going into the evidence or the merits of any other aspect of the matter. Shri Subramaniam is perhaps guilty of overeagerness. But no one, as far as I know, has charged him with dishonesty or corruption. If anyone has such charges, the proper thing would be to send them to the Prime Minister in writing.

Shri Ranga: Why?

Shri K. C. Pant: Because that is what the Santhanam Committee has suggested. Nor do the facts, as they have come to us from the PAC, sug-

gest that his actions were *mala fide*. If there are any new facts, we will be glad to have them. But so far as the facts that have come to us from the PAC are concerned, they do not suggest that his actions were *mala fide*. Jit Paul's letter to the Minister, of which so much is sought to be made, only confirms this impression. Shri Subramaniam has a long record of distinguished public service behind him. He has been a Minister continuously for two decades now, and a controversial Minister at that. And yet, he has always enjoyed a high reputation for integrity.

श्री मधु लिमये : मद्रास हाई कोर्ट ने उन के बारे में रिमार्क्स पास किये हैं।

Shri K. C. Pant: Today with the benefit of hindsight, it is perhaps possible to argue that he should have acted this way and not that way. Be that as it may, putting it at its worst, what the charges amount to is that he exercised his discretion wrongly. But that alone cannot justify the setting up of a formal enquiry against him.

Shri Dwivedy asked, if I remember aright, whether the enquiry committee that would be set up would cover the Minister. I think so far as I can see, any enquiry committee that is set up to go into all the transactions would cover any aspect that is thrown up, whoever is concerned, but it is essential that only the transactions are to be enquired into and not the individuals as such. In the light of all that I have said, I feel that no case has been made out for a separate formal enquiry into Shri Subramaniam's conduct, nor has the PAC suggested it. In the other case, the PAC has suggested it but in this case, it has not. That is the difference.

As I said earlier, so far as any Minister is concerned, the moment the Prime Minister is satisfied that a *prima facie* case exists for a specific formal probe, she should advise the Minister to go. But if she is not satisfied, there the matter should ordinarily end. However, in this particular case, some extraordinary factors have complicated the case. Firstly there are the adverse comments of PAC. Secondly, the observations of the Speaker while giving his ruling on the privilege motion against the Minister; and finally, the very bad reputation of the firm involved in the transactions commented upon by the PAC. Because of these reasons, and also because the traditions of public life are involved, it would in my view by advisable for the Prime Minister to informally seek an opinion from some former judge on the propriety of the Minister's actions. It is my submission that such a course of action would meet the ends of justice as well as public propriety.

Justice also requires that proper action be taken against the firm which lies at the root of all the trouble. It seems to be forgotten in the hullabaloo about the Minister and the Secretary. We in the Committee on Public Undertakings, as has been referred to by Shri Daji, have also had occasion to pass strong strictures against this firm. The Government must deal with the firm sternly and speedily.

So far as the PAC report and the Government's decision on their recommendations are concerned, We on this side of the House have no reason to be dissatisfied with our contribution. Even ignoring the fact that the majority of Members in the PAC as well as its Chairman are from the Congress party, the House will recall that the Members of the Rajya Sabha who took it upon themselves to pursue this matter relentlessly were Congressmen. The Government which has respected the wishes of the PAC also happens to be a Congress Government.

This is a good example of the healthy functioning of the system of checks and balances in our structure.

[Shri K. C. PANT]

except that on the occasion, as far as I can remember, an official rather than a Minister became the target of attack. By and large, Parliament has maintained the tradition that those who cannot defend themselves should not be attacked. A sovereign body must be careful in nursing these traditions. However, the Government too must see to it that Members have other avenues to satisfy themselves in case there are complaints against individual officials.

Another tradition of Parliament is that charges should not be lightly brought and, since the floor is privileged, charges should not be brought by one Member against another without prior intimation. Of late, there have been several instances of the later, and the general tone of public life has suffered as a consequence.

Shri Nambiar: All this was forgotten. Shri A. K. Gopalan was arrested. Wisdom is dawning on them at least now.

Shri K. C. Pant: I refuse to yield Sir. (*Interruption*). When will it dawn on him? Now, the other day, my hon. friend Shri Madhu Limaye brought up a privilege motion to protect the Speaker. From his remarks, it was clear that Shri Limaye did not have too much confidence in the *bona fides* of his informer. And yet, he chose to bring the matter before the House without preliminary confirmation. He is an able man, and an example to us in hard work and thoroughness and I have every respect for him. That is why I am surprised that he should not have thought of confirming the genuineness or even the existence of the document in which the Speaker's name allegedly figured, before raising the matter in the House.

श्री मधु लिमये : वह प्रिविलेज मोशन अमरीक सिंह के खिलाफ है ।

Shri K. C. Pant: The Speaker has given clear-cut rulings in this connection, and I shall quote them. One of them is as follows:

> "The Member should take responsibility for whatever he says. It is not good enough if allegation which is made is proved to be unfounded, because the damage will already be done and the man concerned would unnecessarily be maligned.—Even if later the allegation is proved to be false, what damage has to be done is done. So it is not enough to say that if the allegation turns out to be wrong, it might be cancelled. Whatever a Member says here should be said only after he is fully satisfied himself that it is true and that he has sufficient reason to rely upon what he says. Till then he should not make a statement."

On another occasion, when Shri Mani Ram Bagri made an allegation that Prof. Humayun Kabir had made improper use of the service facilities at the National Physical Laboratory, the Speaker observed that a "Member must make sure what the contents of a particular document are before making allegations on the basis of it in the House."

There was a third occasion when the Speaker drew attention to the rulings given in the Lok Sabha debates of 1963 to the effect that "a Member who makes an allegation against any person should ensure about the correctness of the facts beforehand and should realise his responsibility as a Member."

The reason why I refer to this is not because I want to raise any controversy here, but because I honestly feel that the dignity of public workers is really indivisible. No matter which party they belong to, they tend to have a separate collective identity in the eyes of the people at large. In a democracy, we can only function with a certain minimum of mutual

confidence and mutual consideration for each other's dignity. Unless we observe certain restraints, there is every danger that the public image of the politician in this country will be damaged beyond repair. We, who have taken an oath to uphold the Constitution, owe it to ourselves and the country to see that this does not happen.

Shri Ranga: Sir, all this time I was wondering what has happened to the Cabinet. Was there no Cabinet at all when Mr. Subramaniam was going through this ordeal all these years, when he was passing orders, revising them and re-revising them and afterwards when he was being cross-examined before the PAC? What were his relations with the Cabinet and his Cabinet colleagues? We were asked to believe that at the instance of the Transport Ministry, he was obliged to resile from a part of the punishment he wanted to accord to that guilty firm. But were there no records as between the Trasport Ministry and his Ministry? Did he have any talks with the Transport Minister himself? When he held such strong views as to differ from his own Secretary, when he insisted upon having his own way and refusing to accept his Secretary's advice to limiting this punishment for only two years, why is it he never thought of bringing this matter to the notice of the Cabinet, the Prime Minister and the Cabinet Secretariat?

What was the Cabinet Secretariat doing when he passed one order? Was it informed about it? Then a second order was passed. Was it informed about it? A third order was passed. Was it informed? Why is it that he was completely indifferent to the existence of such a thing as Cabinet Secretariat of such a person as the Prime Minister and of such an institution as the Cabinet? I am surprised how it was that at no stage during all these long discussions, the Cabinet was not brought into the picture at all. It is no good for anybody to try to make Mr. Subramaniam the scapegoat. He was one of the Ministers, a strong Minister, a self-willed Minister, a self-opinionated Minister. Some of my friends believe that he was arrogant. also. I am not prepared to subscribe to that as a general proposition. But certainly he is a strong Minister. He was strong enough to disagree with his Secretary, which many of the Cabinet Ministers are not capable of and do not do unfortunately. He passed that order, which was a very good order. Why was it that that order was not passed earlier when his other colleagues, who still happen to be here as his colleagues, were in charge of that ministry over all these years? Why were they not doing anything? What was the Cabinet doing? Why was it sleeping, through successive Prime Ministers? This is a very important thing that has got to be discussed. My friend, Mr. Pant, the son of my very revered colleague and leader, asked us to look into all these questions of propriety and procedure. Certainly it is relevant to except the Prime Minister and the Cabinet and the ruling party of the country also to look into this matter from this standpoint. What were the relations between this Minister and his ministry? Some of our friends have already askd, why is it that he did not take to task that Iron and Steel Controller? Why did it not occur to him? Why should he have taken all these things for granted that anyhow these things are there as part of the practice; why bother? Why dismiss this man or suspend or punish the other fellow? Why should he take it for granted like that? He failed to wonder why Jit Paul had met him just about the time when the papers also reached him? Why? It is because according to me he felt it was not improper, because he has got too used to these improprieties and improper procedures and activities. The whole system of this Government in general, especially in regard to permits, controls and licences, is so full of these improprieties and irregularities that it did not strike him as any

[Shri RANGA]

thing objectionable or unholy. But certainly he was upset by the manner in which this company had been allowed to commit all these improprieties and irregularities. Therefore, he mustered strength and courage and passed the order. It was after that that he developed cold feet.

15.35 hrs.

[SHRI S. L. SARAF *in the Chair*].

My hon. friend Mr. Pant wanted us to remember the exemplary public life my hon. friend, Shri Subramaniam, has had during the past 12 or 13 years as Minister. That is true. He is known as a strong Minister, headstrong also sometimes. But he is also known to be amenable to political influences. That is where his difficulty comes. Nobody has ever said to my knowledge that he is amenable to money. But he is amenable to political influences. I need not go into very many details. People know how he changed his views overnight in regard to Education in Madras. I know it for a fact that he changed his view in regard to cooperative farming between one meeting of the AICC at Hyderabad and another at Nagpur. I also know he changed his views in regard to controls when he was under the leadership of Rajaji and now when he has come to be under the leadership of these Prime Ministers. That is his weakness (*Interruptions*).

An hon. Member: You have changed parties.

Shri Indira Gandhi: He is not the only one to change his views.

Shri Ranga: Is it the Prime Minister who has dared to whisper this? If she has done it, I have my answer. Her father also made a similar charge against me. I differed from them and I had the moral courage to break away from their party and take all those risks. The risks were very great. If I had not dared them and left them, would I have been defeated in the last general elections? That was the penalty I have paid for having dared her father. I dared them because I differed from them on principles and policies. That is exactly what my hon. friend has never been able to do. Nor was Jawaharlal Nehru able to do that. I do not wish to say what this lady is going to do in future. But I wish to remind her that the country is watching what she is going to do about her statement that the country is more important than the party and therefore she would always place the interests of the country first before the interests of the party. The future will decide whether she would be able to muster the necessary moral courage for that or she would go the way of her own father.

My hon. friend has shown this weakness. My fear is, he has shown that weakness once again in regard to this matter. Otherwise, he would not have got into this troluble at all. He was talking about his conscience. Is he quite sure—can anybody be quite sure—that our reading of the concience is always correct? No less a man than Mahatma Gandhi had had to confess that what he thought to be the promptings of his conscience did not turn out to be his real conscience. He was great enough to confess that.

Therefore, I do not want my hon. friend to go on saying to himself with gumption that his conscience is clear. The question is on what side his conscience is clear? If it is that he thought of money, may be it was clear. If he thought of his own local interests, may be it was clear. But let him think of the political interest also which was behind the successive decisions that he was making and the atmosphere behind them. Some names were mentioned. One was the name of a dead man and another was the name of another colleague of his who is now in the Cabinet. Mention was made about this firm's ramifications among the politicians. I do not know whether

those ramifications were confined only to the Congress Party, only to the Members of Parliament here, only to the Congress Party at the Centre. To find out how influential this firm was, one need not have to go into all the details. Is it not enough that over seven years the Cabint was kept asleep, the rest of the ministers were kept ignorant or indifferent or silent and only the ministers who had to deal with them were carrying on their own merry-go-round-show with this firm? That is why I am not prepared to exonerate my hon. friend.

But my trouble is this. Was this Minister alone responsible or was he being made, knowingly or unknowingly—my fear is some of them did not even know that they were going to place him in such a difficult position—a scapegoat? Was he being made use of by other ministers here as well as other ministers in the States, one or two other politicians, and this firm, all of them together, and in the end he became a scapegoat? But merely because some of us may think that he had become a scapegoat, that he had been made a scapegoat by some other interests who had much more to lose if he did not yield to them and much more to gain and if he yielded to them, merely because he had done this, are we to excuse him and the full Cabinet? It is rather surprising to me —all these four years I have been here during this Parliament when other ministers were being attacked and I have not found all these friends present on those occasions—to find, particularly, my hon. friend, Shri S. K. Patil present in the House, very active today, very much alive to the points of order and procedure of this House. Why is there this anxiety? Why did they not show this anxiety all these years in order to protect the reputation of Parliament, of the Cabinet and of the Prime Minister and also the Minister concerned in this particular Ministry and successive numbers of them? I charge them with the dereliction of their duty in regard to this country.

Is this the only firm? There was the Mundhra firm about which the Ex Chief Justice had written his judgment. There was also the T. T. Krishnamachari and Sons about which both the Houses are witness for such a long time. The President also was made aware of so many things about that firm. There are so many other tycoons the names of which I need not mention. They are known to them because they deal with them and all these tycoons are having their daily dealings with the Iron and Steel Controller and various other Controllers who have got to deal with all these favours that are being distributed in the name of the country through these permits, licences and quotas. All these people have got to be watched. Is this Government competent to watch them when they are dependent upon them for its finances at the time of elections? Apart from these firms, they themselves are having in the different States, one group of Congress fighting against the other with the result they are obliged to spend lakhs and lakhs of rupees on their elections. Therefore, they are not free agents. That is why I am not prepared to agree with the suggestion made my hon. friend, Shri Pant, earlier by Shri Santanam and much earlier by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, that whenever we have any quarrel, any complaint to make against any minister, we should first go to the Prime Minister. We know the high position that the Prime Minister has been able to fall from. All that came out when the CBI episode took place in this House. They appointed a Cabinet Sub-Committee on which the Ex-Chief Justice was also a member. When he was asked: "Is this the report?", he said: "I do not know. We have taken a vow". What vow did they take? They took a vow of secrecy. Therefore, he said, he could not say whether that was the report or that was not the report. But it came to be the report. That was the Cabinet Sub-Committee presided over by the Prime Minister. That is the degree of integrity that they have been able to display. Therefore, we cannot very well leave it to the Prime Minister, any Prime Minister, the kind of

[Shri RANGA]

Prime Ministers that we have been having so long.

What shall we do? My hon. friend says, whenever these things happen, let us not give it to an outside body, let us make a private reference to a Supreme Court Judge or an ex-Supreme Court Judge. Would that be satisfactory? Should there not be a full-fledged Commission of Inquiry.

Shri K. N. Tiwary (Bagaha): Unless you are made the judge there will be no satisfaction for you.

Shri Ranga: Would you care for it? Did you care for the judgment passed against one of the ministers here by the Supreme Court? You have forgotten all aboout it and you have permitted that gentleman into your Cabinet. That is the sense of integrity which you have displayed. That is the degree of respect you have shown to the decision of the Supreme Court.

Therefore, there is no other solution, there is no other remedy for this kind of thing, but the resignation of this Cabinet. If they really mean to maintain a high sense of integrity, if they really wish to convince the people that they care for their interests, that they care for the sacredness of the oath they have taken here in this House and the oath that they have also taken before the President when they took their places in the Cabinet, they should resign.

Secondly, it is not enough that they resign. They should give up this system of controls. To the extent that they must have some control, some permits, some licences, some quotas, they should give up their control here from this Government and place it in charge of a quasi-judicial, completely non-political and independent Commission. Let it administer them. Then it would be easier for people like Shri Subramaniam, who are not amenable to money, to be abel to run their administrative control through secretaries in a more effective, more sensible and wiser manner. As long as they have gone on hugging to these controls, it would not be possible for them to call their souls their own, to say that their conscience is clear. It is impossible for them to keep their conscience clear. Even while the Ministers are asleep their secretaries are playing mischief with them, the controllers are playing mischief with them and so many other officers are playing mischief with them.

Shri Subramaniam said before the Committee that he was strong enough to control his secretaries. Where was his strength? In spite of all his strength, his secretary was able to turn him on his little finger by tickling some Deputy Secretary in the Transport Ministry and then again tickling various other people, the Controller of Iron and Steel and making what would appear to be innocent, mischievous references one after another and delaying implementation of his own order. He thought he was very powerful. Therefore, he said that it must be put into effect immediately. what immediacy was there over that one month? Why did he not enquire about it. Instead he was satisfied with his cabinet post like all his other friends. They must hang on to these posts, otherwise they cannot be happy. You should have a look at some of our friends who are out of office. How doleful they look! Therefore, they must keep on to it; otherwise, something more would go wrong with them. That disease has overtaken many of these people. Some time ago one of the friends who happens to be the President of the Congress party made a kind of suggestion that after ten years these people should vacate. He made an exception for himself, he made an exception for the Prime Minister, very advisedly. Now they have made an exception for the whole lot of them so that they can carry on. It is only because of that that these Secretaries and Controllers and all other people are able to make mincemeat of these Ministers and scuttle all proposals put forward by them.

When the committees go into their affairs we see what weaklings these people happen to be helpless people, incompetent people, incompetent not because they are ordinarily incompetent but incompetence borne out of their inordinate anxiety to hang on to their positions.

Shri Tyagi: Rhetorical.

Shri Ranga: Here is only one man who was mad enough, who was foolish enough and, according to me, honest enough, to resign from this Cabinet. I am sure there were several Ministers here who were not agreeable to this devalution. But did they resign? When the qualms of conscience prick them, are they prepared to resign? There were many Ministers who did not like the Tashkent Agreement. But, did they resign? I made a suggestion that at least three months before the general elections the Ministers should resign. The Home Minister came out with a statement "we are here to defind democracy; therefore, we must stick to our positions". That is their judgement. I am sure that in their calmer moments they will be able to see that I am not, after all, wrong, that there is, what is known as, the national conscience and on the anvil of that national conscience it is not only poor Subramaniam—Subramaniam is only a scape-goat, according to me—even, if he has shown cold-feet, weakness, inexcusable weakness and incompetence, —it is the whole of the Cabinet that stands condemned.

Shri Heda (Nizamabad): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the reports of the Public Accounts Committee are not matters for any party consideration. They are reports given by the Committee elected by the entire House and, therefore, there should never be party considerations in dealing with those reports. I am saying this because the way today's discussion has taken place and the way a few Opposition members have spoken on the subject gives room to the feeling that this is not so. Therefore, I would like to reiterate the position and I for one would not speak on party lines. I will take it as a national Problem and, from this angle alone, I will speak on this.

There are three other things the existence of which, or the knowledge of which, we have to bear in mind. Therefore, this debate gets a little complicated. First is the statement made by the present Steel Minister that, so far as the Fiftieth Report is concerned, there will be an inquiry, as proposed by the PAC. The subsequent supplementaries give ample room to feel that this matter will also be dealt with by that inquiry. The second knowledge that we have is that recently the Committee on Public Undertakings has also presented a Report, proposing an inquiry into three deals which relate to the same group, even though this particular deal is not one of them. As they are similar, Government are committed to order an inquiry into these deals also. As all these deals are inter-related and inter-linked, an inquiry into one deal will involve inquiry into other deals also, though it will not be to a fuller extent. The third knowledge that we have is that the Leader of the House was about to make a statement about an Inquiry Committee. Because of these committees that are coming, the debate at this juncture does not serve the full purpose. The debate, if at all it was necessary, should have come after the receipt of the reports of those committees. I am saying this because one of the members of the Opposition, Shri Daji, made a very pertinent point. He said that there is no question of proving *mala fide*, there is the question of proving *bona fide*.

Shri Daji: Lack of *bona fide*.

Shri Heda: It is a very pertinent point. In this case, the Public Accounts Committee could not give its decision on the *bona fide;* neither could it give any opinion on the *mala fide*. So, what does it mean? It means that before the Public Accounts Committee there was not full data, adequate data, to deal with the matter fully. So, from this angle also, the Committee that is being proposed should have been al-

[SHRI HEDA]

lowed to go into it, its report should have been awaited and, after the report is received, we might, if necessary, hold this discussion here. It is no doubt true that a pressing demand was made for this debate and that is why this debate has come. All the same, to my mind, it is somewhat premature.

What were the forces that were prompting this debate? I do not blame the opposition alone for this debate. I know the climate in the country. Today the country is sick of many things and one such thing is the growing corruption by the big business. The whole country is talking about it; of course, Congressmen are also talking about it; so also the Opposition Therefore, they thought that here is some case where they could discuss that matter and highlight that aspect; whether it was a proper matter or not is besides the point.

I am glad that some aspects have been dealt with by Shri K. C. Pant and some other aspects by Shri Ranga. Among the various State Governments in our country there is one which has made a good name, and that is the Madras State Government. We rarely come across any story or allegation of corruption against the Madras Ministry. Among the State Governments, the Madras State Government has got a higher standard of conduct. I find that Shri Ranga is not here but I would like to assure him that these high standards were set by Shri C. Rajagopalachari, when he was the Chief Minister there. He expected and ensured that other Ministers also maintained those standards. Shri Subramaniam belongs to that cadre and he has come from that Ministry.

Another factor that we have to take note is this. This matter came for decision soon after he took charge. In fact, the earlier notings were done much earlier, not during his regime.

Shri Inder J. Malhotra (Jammu and Kashmir): Who did it?

Shri Heda: You know all that. I need not name him. My hon. friend can easily find it out. Why should I bring in other names? I am not blaming his predecessor either. What I am saying is that he gave this decision soon after he took charge. And what was the decision? In the noting two penalties were suggested, one by the Deputy Secretary and another by the Secretary. The Deputy Secretary had suggested more severe punishment and the Secretary less severe punishment.

16 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

It goes to the credit of Shri Subramaniam that he over-ruled the Secretary and gave the severe penalty.

Now, the question comes, and it has been made much about, that when he revised his earlier decision, at that time he decreased the quantum of the penalty. The point is that we have to understand these intricacies. One is blacklisting. Another is stopping the dealings by the department concerned and informing other departments that that department has stopped dealings with such-and-such firm, which means that the other departments may or may not also deal with that particular firm. The third is that only the particular department stops dealing for certain types.

The earlier noting was for a period of two years only. The second noting has got no limitation of the period. From this angle the second decision becomes more severe to which he has referred and much has been made out of it.

Shri Morarka (Jhunjhunu): It is just the opposite

Shri Heda: Therefore, I would again make the point that all the facts that were necessary for us to decide about a particular person, whether the judgement he took from time to time and after certain developments were right

or not, are not with us. For that the adequate data is not with us. It would have been better—I am not casting any aspersion; I have every respect for every Member of the Public Accounts Committee—had they taken some more time, gone into some more data and then brought out more facts to our light so that it would have been more possible for us to ponder over it.

What, after all, is the verdict of the Public Accounts Committee? The Public Accounts Committee says that the reasons for changing the earlier decision are obscure. Another factor that we have to bear in mind is—I say this because of my observation for the last decade and more—that when any matter comes before the Public Accounts Committee or the Estimates Committee, immediately the minister concerned is not informed. For a long time it is dealt with at the level of the Secretariat and only at the last moment it comes to him. In this case the strange thing has happened. The matter related to Shri Subramaniam as Steel Minister not to Shri T. N. Singh as Steel Minister and he was not informed at all. The Fiftieth Report was given without any reference to Shri Subramaniam. So, I think, the Government should take note of it and whenever in future any matter comes before these respective committees and some minister is involved in it, immediately that minister whatever position he may be holding at the moment should be informed and he should be given a fuller chance.

Another thing that happens is that, now it has come to the consideration of the nation, weight to these committees is not given that should have been given. Those who appear before them should come well prepared. In this very report and in earlier ones we find that officials come and give their evidence without having gone through the whole file. They think that as questions will be coming, they can refer to the file and will be replying adequately. Therefore this matter has come before us. I think, it is time that we create a forum by which all the facts are brought to light and then, as Shri Daji has said, *bona fides* are established. I have no doubt, because of the past of Shri Subramaniam, *bona fides* will be established. The only question is that that forum is to be provided and I will look to the Leader of the House and to the Prime Minister to provide such a forum.

With these words I commend the motion.

श्री मधु लिमये : पहले जो मेरा जो वैकल्पिक प्रस्ताव है वह मैं सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूं । वह इस प्रकार है :

"This House, having taken into consideration the 55th report of the Public Accounts Committee, thanks the Public Accounts Committee and its Chairman for the splendid work they have done and expresses its approval of the Report."

अब मेरा अपना भाषण शुरु करने के पहले मुझको अध्यक्ष जी ने इजाजत दी है कि जो प्रश्न मैं पूछना चाहता था उस दिन आज अपने भाषण के दौरान में पूछूं । इस लिए मैं उस वक्त जो इस्पात मंत्री थे श्री सुब्रह्मण्यम उन से और उस वक्त जो ट्रांसपोर्ट मंत्री थे श्री राज बहादुर जी उनसे सवाल पूछना चाहता हूं । राज बहादुर जी को पहले मैंने नोटिस भी जबानी दिया है । श्री सुब्रह्मण्यम के बारे में मेरा प्रश्न इस प्रकार है :

Will the Minister please refer to the statement of 18th May, 1966 and the evidence given by him before the PAC and state:—

(a) whether he is in a position to state categorically that the late Pratap Singh Kairon and Sardar Swaran Singh were not present at his meeting with Jit Paul on 20th July, 1963;

(b) whether he is in a position to say that none beside himself and Jit Paul were present at that meeting; and

[श्री मधु लिमये]

(c) what, according to him, were the implications of "the kind assurance of support in the industrial undertakings" of the Amin Chand Payarelal Group of firms, an assurance which the Minister has not so far denied having given in that fateful meeting?

यह प्रश्न में सुब्रह्मण्यम साहब से पूछ रहा हूं। मेरा श्री राज बहादुर जी से यह प्रश्न है :

Will the Minister refer to Mr. Subramaniam's evidence at page 43 where Mr. Subramaniam speaks of the report from the Transport Ministry.....

इस बात की ओर किसी का ध्यान नहीं गया है कि मिश्र साहब कहते है कि यों ही ऐसे बात हुई है।

"I had a word with him".

और सुब्रह्मण्यम साहब ने पी० ए० सी० के सामने कहा है कि मुझ को ट्रांस्पोर्ट मिनिस्टरी से रिपोर्ट मिली। इसलिए मेरा प्रश्न है :

Will the Minister refer to Mr. Subramaniam's evidence at page 43 where Mr. Subramaniam speaks of "the report from the Transport Ministry on which he relied" and state whether any reference was made by the Steel Ministry to the Transport Ministry placing all the facts and background material about the Amin Chand Pyarelal's activity before the Transport Ministry; and

(b) whether it was on the basis of this material that the Ministry sent its report or was it a casual conversation with the Secretary of the Transport Ministry;

(c) if there was no such report but only a word from the Secretary, Ministry of Transport (Additional Secretary), will the Minister state whether it represented the considered views of the Ministry of Transport in regard to the Apeejay Shipping Line and its associate firms;

(d) whether the Minister had received earlier complaints about the wastage of foreign exchange caused by the purchase of second-hand ships by this shipping line, their bad maintenance and their disposal as scrap at a fantastically low price;

(e) if so, the action taken by the Government against the Company?

इन दो प्रश्नों का जवाब मुझे आशा है कि मंत्री महोदय अवश्य देंगे। अगर जवाब नहीं देंगे तो जो निष्कर्ष निकलना है वह सदन भी निकालेगा और जनता भी निकालेगी।

यह जो प्रश्न है जिस पर आज हम लोग चर्चा कर रहे हैं, उसकी पृष्ठभूमि क्या है ? यह जो पी० ए० सी० की 50वीं और 55वीं रिपोर्ट है . .

Shri Tyagi: On a point of order.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं आपका प्वाइन्ट आफ आडर एंटीसिपेट करता हूं। चूंकि पन्त जी का संशोधन आ गया है जिसमें 50वीं रिपोर्ट का उल्लेख है . . . .

श्री त्यागी : मैं वह नहीं कह रहा हूं।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं ने यह कारण बताया है कि श्री पन्त ने जो स्थानापन्न प्रस्ताव रखा है, उसमें 50वीं रिपोर्ट का उल्लेख है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He should not refer to the 50th Report.

श्री मधु लिमये : श्री पन्त के स्थानापन्न प्रस्ताव में उसका उल्लेख है। क्या मैं श्री पन्त के प्रस्ताव पर नहीं बोल सकता हूं ?

श्री त्यागी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप मेरा पायंट आफ़ आर्डर सुन लीजिये। बहस के बीच में कोई ऐसा सवाल करना, जिसकी बाबत कोई कागज पेश न हो और जिस से कोई . . .

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष की अनुमति से कहा गया है।

श्री त्यागी : पहले मेरी बात को सुन लीजिये।

मैं बड़ी इज्जत के साथ अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि मेरी राय में कोई ऐसा प्रश्न करना कायदे के खिलाफ़ पड़ता है, जिसमें कोई इनसिनुएशन हो या कोई मोटिव इम्प्यूट किया गया हो, जब तक कि आनरेबल मेम्बर के पास टेबल पर रखने के लिए कोई छपी हुई चीज या कागज न हो। माननीय सदस्य ने पूछा है कि फ़लां वक्त जो बातचीत हुई क्या उसमें कैरों साहब थे। हो सकता है कि वह हों। माननीय सदस्य जो कुछ कहते हैं, वह सच हो सकता है।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं जानकारी मांग रहा हूं।

श्री त्यागी : अगर माननीय सदस्य के पास कोई चीज होती, तो वह पूछ सकते थे कि फ़लां जगह जो कुछ कहा गया है, क्या वह ठीक नहीं है। तब तो ठीक था, लेकिन बिना किसी कारण यह सवाल करना ठीक नहीं होगा, क्योंकि :

"No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a member against any person unless the member has given previous intimation to the Speaker and also to the Minister concerned so that the Minister may be able to make an investigation into the matter for the purpose of a reply;

Provided that the Speaker may at any time prohibit any member from making any such allegation if he is of opinion that such allegation is derogatory to the dignity of the House or that no public interest is served by making such allegation."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Tyagi, I am sorry, there is no point of order.

श्री मधु लिमये : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय धन्यवाद।

बेईमान व्यापार और पूंजी और भ्रष्टाचारी नौकरशाही और सरकार के गठबंधन से जो हमारे देश का सत्यानाश हुआ है उसकी पृष्ठभूमि में हम बहस कर रहे हैं। हमारे सामने बात आई कि इस्पात मंत्रालय के मंत्री ने इस्पात कंट्रोलर को चिट्ठी लिखी कि स्टील बार्टर के बारे में कुछ चुनी हुई फ़र्मों को जानकारी दी जाये। इन फ़र्मों को चुना गया। कोई पब्लिक नोटिस नहीं, कोई टेंडर नहीं, कुछ नहीं। क्या नतीजा हुआ ? नतीजा यह हुआ कि पहले अमींचन्द प्यारेलाल गुट की कम्पनियों का इस्पात के आयात और निर्यात में क्रमशः 9 प्रतिशत और 12 प्रतिशत हिस्सा था, लेकिन जब सरकारी नियंत्रणों का उनके हक़ में इस्तेमाल हुआ और उन पर मेहरबानी दिखाई गई, तो एक ही साल में उनका हिस्सा 9 प्रतिशत से 59 प्रतिशत और 12 प्रतिशत से 60 प्रतिशत हो गया। आज सरकारी नियंत्रणों का इतना गलत इस्तेमाल होता है और कानून तोड़े जाते हैं। जो कानून तोड़ने वाले अधिकारी हैं, उनके लिए एक रास्ता खुला हुआ है और वह यह है कि अगर उनको निकाला जाता है, या अगर वे सेवानिवृत्त होते हैं या अगर वे हटते हैं, तो फिर उन्होंने जिनके साथ मुहब्बत की है कानून तोड़ कर और जिनको रियायतें दी हैं, ऐसी कम्पनियों में उनको नौकरियां मिल जाती हैं। हिन्दुस्तान स्टील में यह हुआ है, एक के बाद

[श्री मधु लिमये]

इंडिया में यह हुआ है । जहां तक स्टील कंट्रोलर के दफ़्तर का सम्बन्ध है, हमारे सामने सबूत आया है कि करीब करीब 45 या 46 बड़े अधिकारियों को इस प्रकार नौकरी मिल गई है । तो इस परिस्थिति को हमें मद्देनजर रखना चाहिए और श्री सुब्रह्मण्यम् ने जो किया है, उस पर सोच-विचार करना चाहिए ।

जो बड़ी बात मैं आप के सामने संक्षेप में रखना चाहता हूं, वह यह है कि 18 मई को श्री सुब्रह्मण्यम् ने जो वक्तव्य दिया, उसमें पहली बार उन्होंने, जीतपाल के साथ जो मुलाकात हुई थी और जीतपाल ने उनको जो पत्र लिखा था, उसका उल्लेख किया था । उससे पहले जब पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी ने श्री वांचू को पूछा था, तो उस वक्त पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी के ध्यान में इस बात को कभी नहीं लाया गया था कि जीतपाल नाम के व्यक्ति से मुलाकात हुई या उनकी कोई चिटठी आई थी, इसलिए पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी को इसका पता नहीं लगा । 18 मई को श्री सुब्रह्मण्यम् स्वयं गवाह के रूप में इस पत्र को और इस मुलाकात को ले आते हैं । जब वह खुद लाये हैं, तो उसके जो अर्थ और नतीजे हैं, उनसे मंत्री महोदय भाग नहीं सकते हैं । मैं मंत्री महोदय पर खुल्लम-खुल्ला आरोप लगाता हूं कि उन्होंने जान-बूझ कर इस पत्र का हवाला देते हुए इसके प्रारम्भिक अनुच्छेदों को छिपाया है । मैं यह आरोप लगा रहा हूं । इतना ही नहीं, उन्होंने सदन को यह बताने की कोशिश की कि अमींचन्द प्यारेलाल कम्पनी के पार्टनर ने जो माफ़ीनामा दिया, केवल उसकी बदौलत वह बदले । उन्होंने कमेटी के सामने कहा है कि मैं इस पर स्ट्रेस देता हूं, जोर देता हूं, बल के साथ कहता हूं कि उनके माफ़ीनामे से मेरे मन में परिवर्तन हुआ । मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि पत्र के प्रारम्भिक दो अनुच्छदों को, जिनमें इंड एशोरेंस आफ़ सपोर्ट की बात है, उन्होंने सदन के सामने इसलिए नहीं रखा कि अगर वे सदन के सामने रखे जाते, तो फिर सदन इस नतीजे पर पहुंचता कि यह माफ़ी-नामा नहीं है, बल्कि मंत्री महोदय ने उनके ऊपर जो मेहरबानी की है, उसके लिए कृतज्ञ और एहसानमन्द हो कर वह उनको धन्यवाद और बधाई दे रहे हैं ।

क्या कहा है उन्होंने अपने पत्र में ?—यह कि हम लोग इतने नये नये उद्योग बना रहे हैं और उनकी लिस्ट दी गई है । जब मंत्री जी पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी के सामने गये, तो उन्होंने उसके बारे में कहा, "दि लिस्ट इज नाट वेरी इम्पोर्टेन्ट" । वह फ़हरिस्त महत्वपूर्ण क्यों नहीं है ? वास्तव में यह फ़हरिस्ट बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण है । उसमें जिन उद्योगों का नाम लिया गया है, उनमें सबसे पहला नाम है काश्मीर सेरेमिक्स का । अभी अभी सभापति पद पर जो बैठ थे, श्री श्यामलाल सर्राफ़, जब वह मंत्री थे, तो उस वक्त यह योजना बनाई गई थी : 40 प्रतिशत सरकारी हिस्सा, 40 प्रतिशत जीतपाल का हिस्सा और 20 प्रतिशत सार्वजनिक हिस्सा ।

श्री श्यामलाल सर्राफ़ (जम्मू तथा काश्मीर) : सत्यपाल ।

श्री मधु लिमये : दोनों एक ही हैं । ख़ैर, सत्यपाल ने यह कहा कि 40 प्रतिशत उसका हिस्सा, 40 प्रतिशत सरकार का हिस्सा और 20 प्रतिशत सार्वजनिक हिस्सा होगा । बाद में नये मंत्री आ गये—दार साहब, तो परिवर्तन यह हुआ कि 39 प्रतिशत सरकार का हिस्सा और 51 प्रतिशत सत्यपाल का हिस्सा । 39 प्रतिशत हिस्सा होते हुए भी आठ डायरेक्ट र में से केवल एक सरकार क था । मजे की बात यह है कि बोर्ड आफ़ डायरेक्टर्स की जो पहली बैठक हुई, उसमें जो एकाउंट्स लाये गये थे, उन पर मतभेद हुआ और सब कागजों को सील लगाई गई ।

एक अरसे के बाद काश्मीर सरकार ने काश्मीर सेरेमिक्स पर एक नोटिस जारी किया । यह नोटिस 8-9-64 का है । मैं आपकी अनुमति से माननीय सदस्यों की जानकारी के लिए इसको प्रमाणित कर के टेबल पर रखना चाहता हूं ।

Shri Raghunath Singh: This is irrelevant. This is not the question at issue. This is the matter of the Jammu and Kashmir State. This is not the point at issue.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: How is that relevant here? Is it referred to in the 55th Report?

श्री मधु लिमये : 55वीं रिपोर्ट के एपेंडिक्स 4 में काश्मीर सेरेमिक्स का उल्लेख है ।

श्री शिव नारायण (बांसी) : पायंट आफ़ आर्डर, सर ।

श्री मधु लिमये : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा सारा समय इस प्रकार नष्ट हो जाता है । मैं आप की अनुमति से इस नोटिस को टेबल पर रखता हूं ।

[*Placed in Libary. See* No. LT-6939/66.]

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: In Appendix IV, the first item mentioned is the Kashmir Ceramics Ltd. That is there.

Shri Raghunath Singh: That is only reference.

श्री मधु लिमये : लेकिन उसके बाद उस नोटिस पर कोई कार्यवाही नहीं हुई है और यहां तक कि काश्मीर सरकार ने जुर्माने के रूप में अपना सारा हिस्सा उन लोगों को दे दिया और सत्यपाल के हाथ में यह कम्पनी है ।

सब से मारके की बात यह है कि सत्यपाल साहब कहते थे कि दो महीने में पैदावार होगी, लेकिन अभी तक पैदावार नहीं हुई है । जिंक, काप्पर और गैल्वानाइज्ड शीट्स के जितने इम्पोर्ट लाइसेंसिज थे, इन लोगों ने उनको चोर बाजार में बेचा है और सब खा गये हैं । मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या श्री सुब्रह्मण्यम् ने ऐसे ही गन्दे कामों में "काइंड एशोरेंस आफ़ सपोर्ट" दिया था । यदि दिया था, तो फिर श्री दाजी ने कानूनी ढंग से जो असद्भाव (मैला फ़ाइडीज़) का आरोप लगाया है, वह सौ प्रतिशत साबित हो जाता है । इसलिए अध्यक्ष महोदय, आगे चलकर आप देखें कि इन्होंने सवाल उठाया है कि जब मैंने अपने हुक्म पर पुनर्विचार किया तो मेरे पास अमीचन्द प्यारेलाल कम्पनी की जो पृष्ठभूमि है, उनका जो भूत है, उसके बारे में कोई जानकारी नहीं थी । तो उसके बारे में इनसे पूछा गया कि क्या आपके सेक्रटरी ने आपके पास कोई जानकारी नहीं रखी कि इन लोगों का 54 से लेकर क्या रेकार्ड रहा है और एक दफा उत्तर प्रदेश में भी इनको ब्लैक लिस्ट किया गया है लांछन लगाया गया है, क्या यह जानकारी आपके सामने नहीं रखी गई ? तो चेयरमैन साहब के प्रश्न और बूटा सिंह साहब के प्रश्न का सुब्रह्मण्यम् साहब उत्तर दे रहे हैं, एक वाक्य देखिये, मैं प्रश्न उठा रहा हूं । सिविल सर्वेंट्स और मिनिस्टर्स के रिश्ते और जिम्मेदारी का, वह कहते है :

"After all, the Minister is to be guided by the office."

अगर हर एक मामले में उनका जो दफ्तर है मंत्रालय है उसी की राय पर मिनिस्टर सहब चलेंगे तो फिर सवाल ही नहीं रहता है, फिर मैं यह पूछूंगा कि आफिस की ओर से जब यह कहा गया कि इनके ऊपर यह साधारण आर्डर जारी न करो, तो उस वक्त आफिस के कहने पर क्यों नहीं गये ? उस वक्त उन्होंने सोचा और ठीक ही सोचा, मैं मानता हूं कि मंत्रालय जो कागज सामने रखता है, उस पर मंत्री महोदय को अपना दिमाग चलाकर काम करना चाहिए, अपना डिस्क्रीशन

[श्री मधु लिमये]

अपना विवेक इस्तेमाल करना चाहिए । यह कहने से काम नहीं चलेगा :

"After all, the Minister is to be guided by the office."

तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि इस मामले में सिविल सर्वेंटस की भी जिम्मेदारी है और मंत्री महोदय की भी जिम्मेदारी है । यह मामला नया नहीं है, बहुत पुराना है और इसलिए मैं किसी पर आरोप नहीं करता क्योंकि यहां पर अध्यक्ष महोदय ने अपना निर्णय दिया है लेकिन आप जरा तारीख याद रखिये कि यह जब मामला चल रहा था तो चार स्टील कंट्रोलर हो गये । एक नटेसन साहब, दूसरे बाल साहब, फिर बी० एन० बनर्जी और फिर एस० पी० मुखर्जी । मैं आरोप नहीं कर रहा हूं । उस समय कौन कौन अधिकारी थे, उनके नाम रख रहा हूं । इस्पात सचिव कौन कौन थे ? बूदलिंगम साहब और वांचू साहब और मंत्री कौन थे ? बहुत पुराने मंत्री का नाम तो छोड़ दीजिये, लेकिन सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह साहब मंत्री थे और बाद में सुब्रह्मण्यम साहब भी मंत्री हुए और यह मामला बहुत पुराना है । जीतपाल ने अपने पत्र में बहुत साफ लिखा है कि इन परिस्थितियों में मुझे ऐसा काम करना पड़ा, तो वह परिस्थितियां यह थीं कि जबकि यह बाल साहब, बनर्जी साहब यह सब स्टील कंट्रोलर थे और बूदलिंगम साहब, वांचू साहब, इस्पात सेक्रेटरी थे, बूदलिंगम साहब ने इस्पात सेक्रेटरी और सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह साहब इस्पात मंत्री थे, यह परिस्थिति है, विशेष परिस्थिति कि जिसमें उनसे गलतियां हो गईं । तो मैं यह निवेदन करूंगा कि सुब्रह्मण्यम साहब ने यह जो कहा है कि मेरे दफ्तर ने जो रखा उसी से मुझको गाइड होना है, प्रभावित होना है, तो खुद उनका शुरू में जो काम था उसके विपरीत यह इनकी बात जाती है और यह छिपाने के लिए यह सब कर रहे हैं ।

अब मैं आरोप लगा रहा हूं कि यह जो षड्यंत्र था स्टील कंट्रोलर, स्टील सेक्रेटरी और स्टीलमिनिस्टर का इसके निर्माता नहीं हैं सुब्रह्मण्यम साहब, यह मैं मानता हूं जिसको आर्किटेक्ट आप कहते हैं—

He is not the architect of this conspiracy.

लेकिन 20 तारीख को जुलाई महीने में जिस दिन यह मुलाकात हो गई, यह इस षड्यंत्र में शामिल हो गये जो पहले से चला आ रहा था ... (घंटी बजने पर) बस इतने में हमको खत्म कर देंगे आप ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member has already taken twenty minutes.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, दस मिनट तो दीजिये, जल्दी जल्दी बोलता जा रहा हूं ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बीस मिनट बोल चुके हैं ।

श्री मधु लिमये : तो दूसरे तो 40-40 मिनट बोले हैं ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He may try to conclude now.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं दस मिनट में खत्म कर रहा हूं ।

तो मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि यह षड्यंत्र जो पहले से चला आ रहा था उसमें सुब्रह्मण्यम साहब 20 जुलाई को सदस्य बने और उसी के कारण उन्होंने अपना यह बयान दिया और इस सत्य को भी पब्लिक एकाउंटस कमेटी से छिपाने की कोशिश की । जब मामला खुल गया तब जाकर जीतपाल के पत्र का और जीतपाल की मुलाकात का हवाला सदन के सामने दिया और वह भी किस स्थिति में ? अध्यक्ष महोदय, सारी बात नहीं लाये । जैसा कि कहा कि माफीनामा लाए गये हैं, लेकिन यह माफी-

नामा का नहीं, यह तो आभार प्रदर्शन का पत्र है । इतने गन्दे कामों में जिसको वह इंडस्ट्रियल अंडरटेकिंग कहते हैं, जरा हमारे दंडेकर साहब बैठे हैं, इसलिए मैं उनकी तसल्ली के लिए कह देता हूं कि मैं तो समाजवादी हूं लेकिन स्पर्धा पर आधारित पूंजीवाद भी है कि जिसमें उद्योगशीलता है, विज्ञान की प्रगति का रास्ता खुलता है पैदावार बढ़ती है, खर्चा घटाया जाता है और उपभोक्ताओं के लिए दाम घटाने की बात है तो उस पूंजीवाद को भी कुछ समय के लिए मैं बर्दाश्त कर लूंगा । लेकिन यहां न गधा है न घोड़ा है । आपके भतपूर्व मंत्री ने समाजवाद की चादर तो बिछा दी लेकिन न समाजवाद आया न पूंजीवाद की जो अच्छाइयां हैं क्योंकि आखिरकार कार्ल मार्क्स ने भी तो कहा है न पूंजीवाद के बारे में कि पूंजीवाद ने भी एक ऐतिहासिक कार्य किया कि विज्ञान की प्रगति की, विज्ञान का इस्तेमाल खेती और कारखाने के सुधार के लिए किया, तो यह भी अगर मान लें कि पूंजीवाद यहां आता पैदावार बढ़ाने वाला, वैज्ञानिक प्रगति करने वाला, लोगों को तंत्र की, टेकनीक की शिक्षा देने वाला तो उसको भी संधि-काल में, दरमियानी अरसे के लिए मैं बर्दाश्त करता, लेकिन हमें जो मिला है वह एक नियंत्रित अर्थ-व्यवस्था मिली है जिससे यह नतीजे निकले हैं ।

अब अन्त में मैं खत्म कर रहा हूं, अमीचन्द प्यारे लाल के तीन कारनामे हैं और इस्पात मंत्रालय के द्वारा जो मेहरबानी की गई है उनके साथ, जो कि पब्लिक एकाउटस कमेटी के सामने भी नहीं आया है, उसके बारे में एक बड़ा अच्छा डाक्यूमेंट मिला है कि वह जब चाहते हैं, मांग करते हैं तो उनकी मियाद बढ़ायी जाती है । यह मेरे पास आयरन एंड स्टील कंट्रोलर का पत्र है जो उनकी एक फर्म ए० पी० जे० प्राइवेट लिमिटेड को लिखा गया है :

"As requested in our letter, the validity of the export licence is being extended to such and such period."

तो आपकी अनुमति से, यह बहुत फटा हुआ है, इसकी नकल बनाकर मैं दे दूंगा ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Is it the original or copy?

श्री मधु लिमये : हां, बिलकुल ओरिजनल है । आप देख लीजिये ।

Mr. Deputy-Sperker: Is it the original or copy?

श्री मधु लिमये : हां, आप की सेवा में, आपकी खिदमत में मैं प्रस्तुत करता हूं ।

[*Placed in Library. See* No. LT-6939/66.]

तो अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो अमीचंद प्यारे लाल की कम्पनी है यह तो बड़ी विचित्र है, अभी भारत बैरेल के मामले में इनके खिलाफ केस चला है और फैसला हो चुका है और इन्होंने जो गन्दे काम किये हैं वह साफ दुनिया के सामने आये है । उसी तरह अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह तीन मामले मैं आपके सामने रखता हूं । तफसील में नहीं जाता हूं । एक यह है कि स्टील कंट्रोलर ने कस्टम्स क्लीअरेंस टर्म गलत ढंग से कानून तोड़कर इस कम्पनी को दिया । कस्टम ने यह स्वीकारा नहीं, उनके माल को उन्होंने बरामद किया और स्पेशल पुलिस एस्टैब्लिशमेंट की तौर से इस मामले में जांच चल रही है । मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि इसके बारे में सुब्रह्मण्यम साहब ने और दूसरे जो मंत्री रहे हैं उन्होंने अब तक क्या किया ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member has already taken 25 minutes. He may conclude now.

श्री मधु लिमये : दूसरा मामला बहुत ही गम्भीर है । यह तो विदेशों से जो चीजें आती हैं उसके बारे में आरोप है कि फोर्ज्ड क्रास बार्डर सर्टिफिकेट भी बनाये गये हैं, मियाद तो खत्म हो गई थी, मैं पढ़कर ही सुनाये देता हूं :

"The importers managed somehow to obtain forged Cross Border

[श्री मधु लिमये]

Certificates from the country of supply certificates purporting to convey fraudulently that these goods had crossed the borders of the country of supply before the expiry of the licence issued by the authorities in this country. I understand that these goods have been confiscated by the Customs at these three ports...."

मतलब कलकत्ता, बम्बई और मद्रास ।

"and the total value is approximately Rs. 2 million."

तीसरा मामला यह है :

"The third case relates to the inquiry by the Central Bureau of Investigation into cheating of the Calcutta Port Commissioners to the tune of about Rs. 1 lakh by the Aminchand Pyarelal firms mentioned in the Report. Claims for refund of demurrage charges were made by these firms on false grounds."

यह तो तीन मामले हो गये हैं, लेकिन अभी खत्म नहीं हुआ है । अगर इनके और-काले कारनामे आ जायें, तो इसमें क्या बुरी बात है ।

अमींचन्द प्यारेलाल कम्पनी ने हिन्दुस्तान स्टील की ओर से 7,900 टन इस्पात मंगाया और सरकार के द्वारा उसको रिजैक्ट करवाया गया । यह इनका टैकनिक था, पहले माल मंगवाते हैं, फिर सरकारी अफसरों को रिश्वत और घूस खिला कर उससे कहलवाते हैं कि यह रिजेक्टेड है, हमारे काम का नहीं है और स्टील कण्ट्रोलर का आर्डर निकलता है कि यह बहुत खराब माल है, आप खुले बाजार में बेच डालिये और फिर मजे से बेचते हैं, उससे पैसा आता है, कहां कहां जाता है पता नहीं । आप फिर कहेंगे कि आरोप लगाता है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इन लोगों ने अकेले कलकत्ता शहर में, जिनका लड़ाई के पहले कोई अस्तित्व नहीं था, तीन करोड़ रुपये की जायदाद (अर्बन लैण्ड प्रोपरटी) बनाई है । अभी इन्होंने एक फ्लरिज रेस्टोरेन्ट लिया है, जिसके लिये पैसा स्विस करेन्सी में, विदेशी मुद्रा में खर्च किया गया । कालेबाजार की विदेशी मुद्रा हम लोगों के पास कितनी है, इससे आप उसका अन्दाजा कर सकते हैं ।

इन्होंने एक पार्क होटल कलकत्ता शहर में बनाया है—एक करोड़ रुपया खर्च करके, लेकिन इस्पात और सीमेंट के लिये क्या कभी इनको परमिट मिला था? परमिट की इन लोगों को क्या जरूरत है, जब मन्त्री इनकी जेब में बैठे हैं, जब बंगाल सरकार के नहीं केन्द्र सरकार के मन्त्री इनकी जेब में हैं, तो इनको परमिट और लाइसैंस की क्या जरूरत है ? आज इस होटल को लाइसेन्स नहीं दिया जा रहा है, क्योंकि ये सरकारी कानून वगैरह तोड़ रहे हैं, यह मामला यदि यहां नहीं खोला जाता तो शायद पार्क होटल इस वक्त चालू हो जाता ।

एक और मामला नार्दर्न रेलवे का है, जिनको इनकी ओर से इस्पात का माल दिया गया था और वह रिजैक्ट किया गया, उसी तरह से जैसे मैंने हिन्दुस्तान स्टील का मामला बताया और उसको लेकर एक चौधरी नाम का अफसर इस वक्त सस्पेन्डेड है, उसकी जांच चल रही है । क्या क्या मामले इनके अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपको बताऊं ।

अन्त में मैं यह कहूंगा, मैं इस बात को यहां छेड़ता नहीं, लेकिन हमारे मित्र पन्त जी ने चूंकि उसका उल्लेख किया है, इसलिये कहना चाहता हूं । उन्होंने मेरा गौरव भी बढ़ाया है, लेकिन साथ ही उन्होंने मुझ को कहा है कि आपने अध्यक्ष महोदय पर भी कोई आरोप लगाया है । अगर वह मेरे प्रिविलेज मोशन को ठीक तरह से पढ़ते या भाषण सुना होता तो उनको पता चलता कि मैंने अध्यक्ष के खिलाफ़ कोई आरोप नहीं लगाया है । मैंने अमरीक सिंह के खिलाफ़ आरोप लगाया है

और अगर जीतपाल का कोई दस्तावेज है तो जीतपाल के खिलाफ़ लगाया है । यह सब मैंने किया है अध्यक्ष की इज्जत, प्रतिष्ठा, शान और शोभा के लिये । आप ऐसा न सोचिये, पंत जी, कि मैं कोई जिम्मेदार आदमी नहीं हूं । मैंने सदन की प्रतिष्ठा को ऊंचा उठाने के लिये सोच-समझ कर यह प्रिविलेज मोशन दिया है ।

अन्त में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि यहां पर कहा गया कि मैं प्रिविलेज मोशन के हथियार का दुरुपयोग कर रहा हूं . . .

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अब इस को खत्म कीजिये ।

श्री मधु लिमये : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप खुलासा करने के लिये मौका देते हैं मन्त्री महोदय को 357 के अन्दर, जो कि एक पवित्र प्रक्रिया मानी जाती है । 357 के अन्दर जब मन्त्री महोदय स्टेटमेंट देते हैं तो वह इतना पवित्र माना जाता है कि उस पर विवाद भी नहीं होता है और उसको जेन्टिलमेन्ज वर्ड माना जाता है । प्रोफ्यूमो ने भी इसी प्रक्रिया के अन्दर बयान दिया था कि क्रिस्टीन किलर से मेरा कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है, हाउस आफ़ कामन्ज ने उसको माना . . . (**व्यवधान**) मेरा नहीं, प्रोफ्यूमो साहब की बात कर रहा हूं । प्रोफ्यूमो साहब के उस बयान को माना गया, लेकिन जब वह गलत साबित हुआ, तो टोरी पार्टी की हुकूमत थी, टोरी पार्टी के वह युद्ध मन्त्री थे, उन्हीं की पार्टी के मैकलियोड साहब ने हिम्मत दिखलाई और अपने मन्त्री के खिलाफ़ वह अनादर का प्रस्ताव लाये और कहा कि यह गलत बात करता है झूठ बोल कर, इन्होंने सदन का अपमान किया है । यह हाउस आफ़ कामन्ज की परम्परा है, वह मन्त्री मण्डल से हट गये, हाउस आफ़ कामन्ज की सदस्यता तक उन्होंने छोड़ दी ।

यह कोई दल का सवाल नहीं है, मैं आज अपने दल की तरफ़ से नहीं बोल रहा हूं, मैं पब्लिक एकाउण्ट्स कमेटी की इज्जत के लिये और सदन की प्रतिष्ठा के लिये बोल रहा हूं । विरोधी दल और सत्ताधारी दल को यह विवाद आज नहीं खड़ा करना चाहिये । आज पाटिल साहब बैठे हैं, इन्द्राजी बैठी हैं, क्या इन लोगों में मैक्लियोड साहब की सी हिम्मत है—यह कहने की कि मेरी पार्टी के मन्त्री ने जो पवित्र प्रक्रिया है, सैंक्रेड प्रोसीजर है, उसके मातहत गलत-बयानी की है । उनके खिलाफ यह कन्टेम्प्ट का प्रस्ताव मुझे क्यों लाना पड़ा, मैं समझता हूं, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बड़े शर्म की बात है कि यह प्रस्ताव मधु लिमये को लाना पड़ा, यह प्रस्ताव लाना चाहिये था, श्री एस० के० पाटिल साहब को, सत्यनारायण साहब को या इन्दिरा जी को यह प्रस्ताव लाना चाहिये था । मैंने केवल अपने कर्तव्य को निभाया है, मैं विशेषाधिकार के प्रयोग का दुरुपयोग नहीं कर रहा हूं । यही मैं अन्त में कहना चाहता था ।

Shri Khadilkar: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, for the last fortnight or so, while observing particularly the early part of our sittings, I have reached the conclusion that because of certain tolerant and flexible attitudes, the Opposition is trying to exploit all those procedural devices, be they call attention notices, be they adjournment motions or be it the of raising matters of privilege of the House. Democracy is a very delicate mechanism. Very objectively, from a distance, from a non-partisan angle, when I look at the proceedings of the House, I feel that great strain is being put on the democratic apparatus at the present juncture, obviously with a view to give a distorted image to the outside world about things that are happening here. This is most deprecable. Though Shri Limaye has disowned this attempt, I do feel that he has exceeded the limits in pressing his privilege motions in this House. That is my view and that view has been shared by many of my friends from this side and the other side.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Khadilkar: Apart from this, unfortunately, the limits prescribed by the Speaker while discussing this Motion, have been completely transgressed.....

श्री मधु लिमये : यह तो आप आरोप लगा रहे हैं अध्यक्ष महोदय पर ।

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: This is a reflection on the Chair.

Shri Khadilkar: He had laid down certain limits. You have transgressed them.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: No. The Speaker was present when I was speaking.

Shri Khadilkar: Have some patience. What was said by the Speaker in terms of the motion has not been adhered to .....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not think anybody has transgressed the limit.

Shri Khadilkar: No, Sir. Excuse me. I say it and I am going to prove it. I want to prove it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He should withdraw what he said. It is a reflection on the Chair (*Interruptions*).

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: You cannot accuse the Speaker like that. There must be a limit.

Shri Khadilkar: I am accusing the Opposition.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: You are accusing the Chair. The Opposition was not guiding the proceedings of the House. The Speaker was guiding the House.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You please call him to order. You do not call him to order.

Shri Khadilkar: You have transgressed the limit. As I said, I am going to prove it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You are not justified in making allegations like that.

Some hon. Members: He should withdraw.

Shri Khadilkar: You must listen to me. If I do not prove it to the hilt, I will withdraw.

The question is this: in this motion what is under discussion? The 55th Report of the PAC and one paragraph of the 50th Report.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Nobody has referred to the 50th Report only people have referred to the 55th Report.

Shri Khadilkar: The extent of the argument has covered such a wide ground, and the fundamental issue I am placing before you is this. The Public Accounts Committee is an all party body which functions judiciously and conclusions are drawn, and as the Speaker observed, it is a miniature Parliament, all parties are there. So when the Chair permits us to discuss the report of the Public Accounts Committee is it open to us to go beyond certain limits while arguing a case?

Again, I would like to remind the House that we are debating the 55th Report. In the 50th Report in their wisdom, the Public Accounts Committee thought there should be an enquiry. Here there are only two points. At one stage they have said that the explanation given by the Minister is obscure, it is not very clear as to why he made a change. Another thing is whether the order was final or it was a draft order. Only on these two points they can say whether it is obscure, why it is obscure etc.

Nobody is going to defend here Aminchand Pyarelal and his dealings. The question is: Was the hon. Minister in the discharge of his duties as a Minister blameworthy, was he activated or was he at any period acting in a manner in which he should not have acted? There are certain

things, but before touching that aspect I would like to place one other point before you for consideration.

Most of the speakers here have adopted a jurisdic attitude to the actions of the Minister. Is it justified, I would like to ask. Can you adopt a jurisdiction attitude to certain action of the Ministers....

Shri Daji: Why not?

Shri Khadilkar: ..... while he is acting under certain pressures? Is it justified? (*Interruptions*).

Just listen, let me explain. When I used the word "pressure" they are jubilant, but they will not be so jubilant when I explain. Pressure of time is there.

Shri Daji: What is the pressure of time?

Shri Khadilkar: Certainly he has got to take quick decisions. Pressure of time is there. Then, he has got to look to all the aspects. In the present context of the Indian economy....

Shri Daji: What context?

Shri Khadilkar: ... If production is suffering, he must consider; whether injustice is likely to be done, he must take that into consideration. Therefore I am not saying that every action done under pressure is justified, but I would like to plead with the Opposition that if you adopt a jurisdic approach to the doings of the Minister, you are not doing justice to the parliamentary or Government procedures as we have adoped it. This is my view whether you accept it or not.

Shri Daji: This is not the view of the PAC.

Shri Khadilkar: Those whose heads are little cool are bound to reflect quickly whether they can take a juristic attitude of judgment over the act of the Minister and pass some strictures on his conduct. Whether it is justified or not, that aspect should be considered.

There is another question. Mr. Subramaniam appeared before the PAC. This is the evidence. Let us try to judge from the evidence what points he made. I have jotted down a few points. Do not just go with the impression that he was there to suppress the truth. Is it correct to say that? I am just reading out the appreciation of the evidence, I have culled out a few points here.

It was the Minister himself, Mr. Subramaniam, who brought on record the interview of Jit Pal. You must recognise this. It shows that there was nothing to hide in regard to the interview. If he had not mentioned it, you can see the evidence, at this stage in the PAC such a question would not have been raised. He himself brought forward this point on his own.

Shri Daji: Otherwise, how could he have done? That was the only explanation available.

Shri Khadilkar: The letter of Jit Pal says that the Minister had taken stern attitude and that he admonished Jit Pal. This shows the Ministers's clean postition in regard to the interview. What has happened? Let us try to put things right. The Minister issued an order which has to be executed by the Iron and Steel Controller's organisation, with not a very good reputation. I do not want to say anything further. That organisation with headquarters at Calcutta has not a very high reputation. As soon as some order is given, the officers there send back queries. It is open for you to say: why did he not insist on execution? I am arguing the case as you have argued. But the querries are such that he needs to examine them further, whether production unit should be excluded or the shipping companies should be excluded. I admit that the leakage must have taken place in Calcutta. That was the source. Then the whole thing developed? You have to realise that it is the Secretary who is to issue the order according to the procedure. If somebody sends back an order saying that this order is difficult, it would affect production, etc. should the

[Shri Khadilkar]

Ministers sit tight on his order or should he reconsider that order? Mr. Dandekar is here; he has served as a high executive. I would put this question to him. What would he have done in such a situation? With a clean conscience anybody would say: all right, I will reconsider. Certain leakage must have taken place at the other end and the firm representative came and saw him. Then the question arises: is it proper for the minister to do so? There are some mistakes, I admit. In UK the ministers always record that such a decision had been changed on this ground. Unfortunately, that record is not here. I am arguing case in a non-partisan attitude.

Shri Daji: The reasons here could not have been recorded. They are obscure, dark and drab reasons.

Shri Khadilkar: In a situation like this, you have to take into consideration all these factors. The Minister is in Delhi; he issues an order to be implemented by some organisation in Calcutta which is not free from coruption. There is a leak. After that the Minister finds that there is some justification and changes the order. Can you attribute motives?

Shri Daji: What were the pressures you referred to?

Shri Khadilkar: Pressures are in your party and in every party.

Shri Daji: What were the pressures on Mr. Subramaniam which made him change that order. Tell the House.

Shri Khadilkar: The issue came up before the PAC. Our party majority was there but the issues were not decided at party level. They were decided independent of party views. you not given credit to the PAC which it really deserves in the 50th report? I am not referring to the whole thing; that paragraph is there, and therefore I am referring to it. If you go through it you will find that a thorough job has been made and that report will certainly prompt the Government to take some action. That is a different matter. So, if you have given credit for the 50th report for impartiality, objectivity and non-partisan attitude, what prevents you from giving it the credit, the same credit, to the samebody, when it has come with this conclusion before the House?

Shri Daji: What are the conclusions?

Shri Khadilkar: The conclusions are clear, they could not make up their mind as a body....

Shri Daji: The PAC has censured Shri Subramaniam by saying that there were obscure reasons. That is a polite way of saying it. Only polite language has been used by the PAC. Obscure reasons which cannot be told, which are secret reasons. That is the English meaning of "obscure reasons"

Shri Shinkre (Marmagoa): Anybody knows what is the meaning of "obscure reasons." Is the hon. Member trying to teach us grammar? What does he mean?

Shri Khadilkar: Please observe the grammar of decorum. Sit down. Now, about the second report, the 55th report. The Minister appeared before the Committee. He volunteered himself. Left to myself, I would have advised him not to do it. There was no necessity, but he volunteered himself. Now, only at two places there are remarks, which are not very complimentary, about the conduct of the Minister. Beyond that, there is nothing. I would like to know what this ballyhoo is about, which has been made on that side, about the 55th report and the conduct of the Minister. As the Speaker has said in the beginning, let us try to discuss the report at a non-partisan level. I may now recall the system in the British parliament. That is a good system which we should try to adopt. When the report of the Public Accounts Com-

mittee is under discussion, the only points which we have to consider are the administrative lapses and not the broad canvass of the whole national life which is brought in. Only the relevant points should be taken up and discussed. That is a very healthy convention. If you want to keep the prestige of the PAC, which richly deserves it, in this present context especially because they have earned a name—they are the watchdogs of Government's finances—and if this body is to function without party pulls and pressures from this side or that side, I would appeal to the Opposition and to every Member of the House to look at the report from this angle. Therefore, the 55th report which is under discussion, does not convict Shri Subramaniam of charges which have been levelled from that side. You can bring in Jit Paul; you can bring in Aminchand Pyarelal, and so many other firms, and so many other extraneous matters. But then. I would ask you, can you bring in these extraneous things as evidence to convict him? That would be injustice, and that will be doing injustice in a way indirectly through a vote of censure on the PAC. What the PAC has said is, "No further probe is called for."

Shri Daji: Read the report.

Shri Khadilkar: I have got the report.

Shri Daji: Then read the "obscure reasons." Read King's English.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Khadilkar: I will conclude in a minute. I have been interrupted often. Therefore, my humble plea is this. If we accept the PAC as a competent forum of all parties representing both the Houses, and if we accept that their conclusions are very judiciously drawn up, I can tell you one thing. As a former member of the PAC and Chairman, I can tell you, 90 per cent of the recommendations of the PAC have been acted upon and implemented by the Government. This is my experience for the two years I was there as a Member. Therefore, if the PAC in their wisdom says in one report that the whole gamut of these dealings must be gone into thoroughly and in the second report on one point it say, "We are not yet very much satisfied"—they could not make a recommendation to the effect "No, we certainly suspect him, we suspect his motives and a further probe is called for,"—if that is so, I do not think that in fairness, those hon. Members were fair to the PAC report and they were not fair when they levelled the accusations. It will have some propaganda value of course on the eve of the elections. I know it. That is the main thing. You can do a little damage to the general image of this party. But the image of Parliament and the image of Public Accounts Committee is much higher. Therefore, I would appeal to them, "Don't follow this path. Desist from it. Otherwise, this delicate apparatus of democracy will not survive in this country.

16.55 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Shri Nambiar: Sir, I am very sorry that a senior member like Mr. Khadilkar said that we have mooted out this question to create an atmosphere whereby we may gain on the eve of the elections. It is not so. We have done it in the larger interests of the nation, to see that this sort of robbery is not allowed by certain firms who are doing it as a matter of practice for several years.

I welcome this whole episode which brings to light so many other factors which otherwise we would have had no occasion to know. What is stated in para 4.128 of the 50th report of the Public Accounts Committee which is under discussion is that Mr. Subramaniam should not have issued that second order; that second order was not justified. What is the purport and meaning of the report.

[SHRI NAMBIAR]

I, do not wish to enter into the niceties of the phraseology used by Mr. Subramaniam in his evidence before the Public Accounts Committee or in his further submissions here. I would point out that he has erred in several ways. His mistakes may be wanton or otherwise; but he must accept that they are mistakes.

Mr. Subramaniam, during his different versions, shifted the grounds which naturally led to suspicion about his conduct in the affair. He tried to pounce on the Public Accounts Committee for its observation made in the 50th report and belittled its effort. This has added to the suspicions. He rushed to the Public Accounts Committee to explain off the discrepancies, but failed. All this has strengthened the feeling in the country that Shri Subramaniam, being the Minister in charge during the period from November 1962 to July 1963 when the heavy financial losses to the exchequer arising out of the bilateral agreements entered into by Amin Chand Pyarelal and connected firms were disclosed, showed further leniency to these blacklisted firms. Nobody accuses Mr. Subramaniam for these barter deals because they were not done in his period.. We will go to his predecessor for that and I hold that his predecessor Mr. Swaran Singh and some of the high officials of his ministry who were responsible for these deals cannot escape at all.

But having taken charge of the ministry in November 1962, he ought to have realised the full impact of the havoc and losses committed by his predecessor and the officials of the ministry in entering into the bilateral deals of Amin Chand Pyarelal and connected firms. Correctly he initiated action against them but at a stage after orders were passed to blacklist all these firms for the heavy losses incurred, why did he go back on his order of 28th June 1963 to blacklist Amin Chand Pyarelal and connected firms? What made him dilute that order? That is the crux of the problem.

My friend, Mr. Khadilkar, said that there were no strictures against Mr. Subramaniam. Let us see the wording of the report:

> "The sub-committee are unable to understand the circumstances under which the minister changed his previous orders so soon that the business with Messrs. Amin Chand Pyarelal group of firms should not be communicated to other Government Departments."

It is clear that he changed his stand so soon and the reasons have to be given by him. In all fairness, it is his duty to enlighten us about the reasons. The reasons, as stated by him, are not satisfactory, because the various circumstances under which he changed the order are now well-known to the hon. members.

17 hrs.

Sir, Messrs. Aminchand Pyarelal companies are well known, having failed to carry out the previous commitments ever since 1954. As they are well known to his Ministry, why should they be relied upon by the Minister? During the course of one year of his tenure, by July 1963, by the time when he issued these modified orders, he might have had occasions to study this company. Again he believes Mr. Jit Paul, one of the representatives of this firm, when he sought an interview with him on 20th July, 1963. Knowing that some action was being contemplated against this firm, and as it leaked out from his Ministry, as one of the hon. Members has already said, he should have suspected these people coming to him on that particular date. When the whole thing leaked out, he should have enquired as to how it leaked out and an enquiry should have been conducted into that. Instead of doing that he conceded to the representations made by Mr. Jit Raul on 20th July.

On 23rd July, only three days after his interview, Shri Subramaniam modified the order, modifying the previous one nullifying its effects. Is an undertaking given by Aminchand Pyarelal and Company worth anything considering the background of their past behaviour? Are we to understand that Shri Subramaniam is so naive as to believe such an undertaking? It is here that the public has a genuine and reasonable doubt about the conduct of Shri Subramaniam. Therefore, in his own personal interest and for the benefit of a fair enquiry it is all the more necessary that he should step down from the office. Public Accounts Committee has rightly raised the doubt, as is now shared by the entire Opposition and the public.

Therefore, my first demand is that Shri Subramaniam should resign and clear the way and create the atmosphere for a thorough probe into the affair of his then Ministry and that of his predecessor Shri Swaran Singh under whom the entire deals were finalised at a great loss to the exchequer. His predecessor's conduct is equally suspecious, so far as I am concerned—I do not know about others—and in all fairness he should come forward to clear his own self from the blemish by stepping down along with Shri Subramaniam. I do not demand the resignation of the entire Cabinet. At least these two Ministers who are directly connected with the affair should step down in their own interest and in the interest of the nation. I have no personal grouses against them. If there is some chance, after clearing the charges against them, I would like Shri Subramaniam and Shri Swaran Singh to come back and do their work. But, unfortunately, there is so much cloud in their behaviour during their period of office and there is so much of dirt in the office of the Iron and Steel Controller and the Steel Ministry relating to this period, with which they themselves will agree, that they must clear all that.

One is delighted at the hard work put by the Public Accounts Committee. It was mentioned at the very beginning that during these discussions there may be some criticism against the Public Accounts Committee and its activities. Here we are proud that we have got such an efficient Public Accounts Committee.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Sir, I rise to a point of order. There is no mention of Shri Swaran Singh in the report of the Public Accounts Committee. Why is the hon. Member referring to Shri Swaran Singh and saying that he should also resign along with Shri Subramaniam?

Mr. Speaker: I said in the morning that we should not go beyond the 55th Report. He should not refer to periods that are not covered by that report.

Shri Nambiar: What is the background under which Shri Subramaniam changed his orders?

Mr. Speaker: No, . . ., we have decided that in the morning. I will not allow that.

Shri Nambiar: A series of action took place.

Mr. Speaker: No, I will not allow him to mention all those things.

Shri Nambiar: Sir, in his own interest and for the benefit of the country I am mentioning this. If he is not prepared to resign, I leave it to him.

Mr. Speaker: I have to decide whether it is relevant here.

Shri Nambiar: Sir, we are proud that we have got such a good Public Accounts Committee. Now the point is, how the whole truth will come out and how justice can be meted out. A thorough probe should be conducted into the whole affair and in that connection I have to draw attention to certain facts that are behind this episode. I will now draw attention to the facts behind the episode. You

will notice that Aminchand Pyarelal and their associates were blacklisted from 4th August, 1954 to 29th January, 1957 by the Works, Housing and Supply Ministry, Surendra Overseas from 26th October, 1956 to 29th January, 1957 by the same Ministry; International Sanitary Engineering were blacklisted from 15th August, 1954 to 29th January, 1957. by WHS Ministry; India Engineering Works were blacklisted from 4th August, 1957 to 29th January, 1957. The records are already with the Government. The fact of blacklisting has been circulated to all the Ministries. How could it be possible for the Iron & Steel Ministry to enter into a barter agreement with such a firm after the new scheme was introduced in 1959? That barter scheme deals with imports and exports. It says that imports would be allowed to the extent to which exports are made; rather, both must be equal. This proposal was mooted in 1959 when Shri Subramaniam was not there as Steel Minister. Another Minister, his predecessor in office, was responsible for this. When these firms were already blacklisted and the records are available to the Government, how could this barter scheme which was a new scheme, be entrusted with such firms. That is the issue.

Here we will find that the actions of the Steel Ministry, Iron and Steel Controller and other concerned officials are all irregular. Mention has already been made as to how these firms were under-invoicing and indulging in all sorts of malpractices. They were cheating even the customs and this was made known to us. That being so, how could the Minister who is responsible and who is acting, as he says, in the larger interest and on certain convictions, allow such a slip to take place? Are we to take it that these two Ministers, the former Minister . . .

Mr. Speaker: Again, he is referring to him.

Shri Nambiar: He was there at that time as Minister and he created the atmosphere in which Shri Subramaniam had to function. As we know, Shri Subramaniam went to that Ministry in April, 1962. When he went to the Ministry was it not necessary for him to go into the past dealings? After all, he has come to the conclusion, as per his order of November, 1962, only a few months after his taking charge, that he should blacklist these firms. So, he knew their antecedents. Should we not expect from him to inquire into the past deals of this firm before passing any order? He should have done that and I think we are fully justified in expecting an answer to that question.

Therefore, our contention is that he has not followed it up; he has given it up at a particular stage and he had watered it down. That is the accusation that we are making. It is not a question of getting some cheap publicity, or blaming the Government, on the eve of the elections. When there is such serious misbehaviour by all these firms right from 1954, are we to shut our eyes on them and say that everything was done correctly by these firms? Therefore, the intentions of the opposition parties should not be misunderstood; they should be properly understood.

In this background, is it not right and proper on our part to demand of Shri Subramaniam and Shri Swaran Singh to clear the clouds that have already gathered around the horizon? The clouds are there, whether we mention it or not. They are there for the whole country to see in the Fiftieth Report. We can always quote the facts given in the Report which nobody can dispute.

Therefore, we say that a full probe is required. But that probe is not forthcoming. The probe must be proper and fair. It must be conducted, as suggested by the Public Accounts Committee, by the Chief Justice of a

High Court or the Judge of a Supreme Court, assisted by the representatives of the Comptroller and Auditor-General and such other officials as are necessary.

Such a probe must follow only after the resignation of the concerned ministers; otherwise, we have got every reasonable doubt that these ministers, who are already in office, would have the opportunity to throttle or circumscribe or narrow down the activities of the probe. That is our fear. This is genuine. Past history has shown that such things are possible. Therefore we submit, let them step down, clear the way and clear the atmosphere, let the probe come and in that probe let them come out successful with flying colours if they are innocent. We will have all the gladness to receive them back amidst us, unscathed. We have no objection. Here we are not attempting to do any harm to them, to their reputation or to the reputation of the Congress, but now the reputation of the Congress as a party and the ministers themselves has suffered very much in this country. It is up to them to clear this bad reputation and come forward and face the facts after resigning from the Ministry. It is not a very big thing for Shri Subramaniam or Shri Swaran Singh, as far as I can understand, because they are political men of long-standing and to them this is nothing. They can write it on a quarter sheet of paper and throw it and face the inquiry and come out unscathed. That must be the sportsmanship with which they must come forward.

Shri G. N. Dixit (Etawah): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I congratulate the Chairman and Members of the Public Accounts Committee for having done a good job of their work without fear or favour in public interest. I have functioned as Chairman of the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit for five years under your nomination and my Committee's work is very limited, only to see that Members do not disqualify themselves by accepting offices of profit, but here is a Public Accounts Committee which has to watch the public accounts of the whole nation. Therefore the congratulations are still double-fold, hundred-fold.

So far as this report is concerned, I have examined the report and all the connected papers. I have also examined all relevant law and I feel that at one point a very important thing has escaped the attention of the Committee and on account of that escape the entire report suffers from that escape. That is that there is a code mentioned here, the Standardisation Code, and it is mentioned that subclause (5) of that Code has been referred to by the Steel Controller. It is in the letter of the second back reference as they say. This Code was a very important piece of document and the Committee and the officials also must have examined that Code and seen whether in the light of that Code, the order which is now the impugned order, the so-called black listing Order, was in violation of the powers of the Steel Minister or not. With little knowledge of that Code I may say that the blacklisting order of the Minister, the first order and not the background order—there is one background order which is called the first order; that is the order in which on the basis of a contractual break between the Government and that contrator it has been decided by the Government that they will give no further contract; I am not talking of that background order of November, 1962 but I am taking of the order of July wherein the Minister has ordered Blacklisting under that Code, it was in violation of the powers of the Minister. He could not pass that order without the concurrence of other ministries—in two clauses without the concurrence of the Home Ministry and in two clauses that of the administrative ministry. The fifth was not applicable. If he could not pass that order, was not the Secretary, Shri Wanchoo, right to make the correct recommendation under the Code and was not the Steel Controller right to make that back reference that nothing shou'd be done against the law? My hon. friends

[Shri G. N. Dixit]

some of them here, are entitled to break law, are entitled to act against Rules in this House, but officials have their duty to act according to law, according to rules made from time to time. I think, it is not proper to condemn people who are not sitting here and who are not represented here. I think, the Committee should have considered the code and I still appeal to you, if you think that this is a point which deserves serious consideration, this code must be examined and seen by you and by the Committee.

My submission is this. What is there against Mr. Subramaniam? The Committee has not charged Mr. Subramaniam of *mala fides*. There is a talk about his statement also. I have examined all his statement and the questions put to Mr. Subramaniam. At the best, the Members have charged him only for acting under the influence of the Secretary or acting under the influence of the earlier Steel Minister. I ask: Are you not conversant that every Member of this House approaches for public causes one Minister or the other? I also ask: Is it not the duty of the Secretary to advise his Minister persistently to do the right thing? If the Secretary advised the Minister again to do something, which he had earlier advised in his note, what was wrong—assuming that were correct; I do not know whether this is correct or not—even then there was no case of *mala fides*. Neither in the questions put in the Committee nor in this House, any Member has charged Mr. Subramaniam of any misconduct. There being no charge of misconduct, what is there to be sent for an inquiry? I can not understand this.

There is only one thing against Mr. Subramaniam, that he chose to go into the witness box that he chose to be his own lawyer and that he chose to be his own witness. When, in the beginning of 1930s, I came to Bar, my senior advised me only two things; that is, as a lawyer, never be your own lawyer and as a lawyer, never be a witness. I may tell you that I have always seen, whenever a lawyer has tried to be a witness...

Shri D. C. Sharma: A lawyer never makes a speech unless he is paid for it.

Shri G. N. Dixit: I was submitting that the only thing which can be attributed against Mr. Subramaniam is that he committed an error in crossing this code of conduct of a lawyer. He has been a lawyer; I have read from his statement that he has been a lawyer. Naturally he has bungled as a witness. Even the tallest lawyer of the country like Mr. Pathak, if he were to go into the witness box, he may also bungle. In that context, I say, I brush aside this statement of Mr. Subramaniam. I may tell you one incident which happened to me. The late Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant directed me to appear in an election petition case in 1953. I made it a winning case. My client was a lawyer and a Member of the U.P. Assembly. For two days, he bungled because he was a simple man then I saw he was sorry and he thought he was losing the case, I argued, "My client may be a fool or a simpleton but be he is not a fraud." (*Interruption*) I am not saying anything about the hon. Minister.

Now my submission is this. With these two things...

Mr. Speaker: Lawyers, when they come here, should speak as members; they should forget that they are lawyers.

Shri G. N. Dixit: I shall keep that in mind. Now what is this? A report has been made by the Committee for inquiry into the lapses; the lapses are categorised. Now those lapses can be inquired into by the Vigilance Commission. The Vigilance Commission has as its Chairman a retired judge of the High Court, a very eminent judge, and it can take such assistance as it desires.

As regards the question of the Minister, my hon. friends, Mr. Pant and one other have made a certain suggestion. Unfortunately I do not agree with it for the simple reason that an inquiry can be held only under the Commission of Inquiries Act and the Commission of Inquiries Act lays down that when there is something to be inquired into, an inquiry will be made. Now what is there to be inquired into here? The Secretary has made a statement that he did not influence the Minister. The Minister has made a statement that he was not guided by the Secretary. The only person, from whom an enquiry has to be made is Mr. Swaran Singh; Mr. Swaran Singh is the on'y person from whom an enquiry is to be made on this allegation, whether Mr. Subramaniam acted under the influence of the Secretary or not, and the Prime Minister is the proper person to make that enquiry. (*Interruptions*)

Now, as I said, what is there to be inquired? Unless there is some point to be inquired into on the facts and data before the House, no inquiry is to be made; no inquiry is to be made just for the fun of it or because the Opposition, in the interest of their elections, wants an inquiry to be made. There will not be any end to these demands for inquiries: one inquiry against somebody, the second inquiry against Mr. Swaran Singh, the third inquiry against Mr. Asoka Mehta, the fourth inquiry against Mr. S. K. Patil and the fifth inquiry against the Madam Prime Minister. There is going to be no end to these inquiries. The point that I am making is that the demand for the inquiry is *mala fide*; it is made by the Opposition keeping the elections in view; as you said in the House, all sorts of privilege motions and other motions are being brought one after another. The intention is *mala fide*: the intention is to bring down the Government and it is not done in pub'ic interest. Therefore, I say that there is no case for an inquiry to be instituted under the Commission of Inquiries Act.

Another suggestion was made by one of my hon. friends that the Prime Minister should consult some retired High Court judge. I say that we have got such eminent lawyers, top lawyers, as Mr. Pathak and Mr. Sachindra Chaudhuri in the Cabinet and then a retired High Court judge of the eminence of Mr. Chagla is here; I may tell the House that Mr. Gajendragadkar was junior to Mr. Chagla and Mr. Sarkar is junior to Mr. Gajendragadkar. Why should Mr. Chagla not be consulted? Why cannot Mr. Pathak or Mr. Chaudhuri be consulted in this matter? In fact, there is no provision for consultation from any outside agency. (*Interruptions*). With all my respects to the late Prime Minister, Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri, may I say that last time when there was a dispute on the question of law, on the question of propriety, whether consultation should be made with an outside judge or not, I was of the view that Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari was perfectly justified in saying there shou'd be no consultation from outside judges, there is no provision for such a consultation; there is no provision for this in law. There is a provision for an inquiry to be instituted under the Commission of Inquiries Act, but here there is no case for an inquiry to be made under the Commission of Inquiries Act. There is no case for consultation from an outside agency. When persons like Mr. Chagla, the ex-Chief Justice of Bombay High Court, Mr. Pathak and Mr. Chaudhuri—such eminent jurists and top lawyers of the country—are in the Cabinet, there is no necessity for an enquiry from outside. Then, we the Members of the Congress Party have elected our Prime Minister and placed all our faith in that Prime Minister. It is for the Prime Minister to discharge her responsibility by taking a decision in the matter.

Finally, I would say one thing more and it is this. The Constitution on'y makes one provision in regard to Ministers and it is that there shall be a Council of Ministers and that the Ministers shall be appointed by the

[Shri G. N. Dixit]

President on the advice of the Prime Minister and shall stay in office during the pleasure of the President. This august House is the highest legislative body in this country. But the Constitution has laid down the scope of the legislature, the executive and the judiciary separately. The Supreme Court is final in the matter of the judiciary. The President is the top executive acting on the advice of the Ministers. This House or this Parliament is the top legislative body. That being the position, the Prime Minister is acting as the adviser to the President and has independence in that respect, and this House should not coerce her in any way or pass a resolution in derogation of that.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: It has been suggested by some Members of the Congress Party that the 55th Report of the Public Accounts Committee has passed no strictures against Shri C. Subramaniam. If that were really so either with regard to the 50th report or with regard to the 55th report, then there would not have been any meaning in Shri C. Subramaniam coming before this House on the 18th May, stunned to the quick as he was, and making a lengthy statement before it trying to explain away the remarks about himself made by the Public Accounts Committee in their 50th report in para 4.128. It is very clear that whatever may have been the language, cautious and guarded language, in which the committee couched their remarks, it was nothing but an implied condemnation of the decision taken by the Minister. In the 55th report, in spite of the Minister's explanation before this House, in spite of the Minister's evidence before the Committee which he had given on his own accord, the committee have come to the conclusion that they have found no reason why the views already expressed by them require any modification.

The Minister of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation (Shri C. Subramaniam): That was before my examination.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: In the previous paragraph, namely para 1.37 of the 55th report, the committee have clearly indicated the implications of the decision that Shri C. Subramaniam took. That paragraph is just a two-sentence paragraph which I am reading wherein they have stated that:

> "It is obvious that the revision of the orders made on 23rd July, 1963, meant in effect, that no action whatsoever, was taken against this group of firms in this case as the earlier order of suspension was still in operation. This indicates that 'full consideration' was not given at the time of revising the orders.".

The firms referred to here are the group of firms Aminchand Pyarelal and others. This means that the committee have stated in plain language that the Minister by letting off this firm of Aminchand Pyarelal's without any kind of punishment or without exacting from them any kind of penalty for their lapses had just exonerated them more or less, so to say. That is the gravamen of the charge against the Minister.

But I for one would not like to take a scapegoat of Shri C. Subramaniam personally. He is a victim of a whole set of vicious circumstances and here, as was pointed out by our colleague, Shri Madhu Limaye, who played a leading role in bringing this matter before this House, it is the system which has to be condemned; the system is one of collusion between corrupt politicians, corrupt ministers, corrupt officials, corrupt government departments and business firms.

We are precluded by your ruling to refer to the various things discussed in the 50th Report of the Public Accounts Committee. Still it is a public document and I can only commend to all Members of the House the other parts of the document for their peru-

sal, those other parts which do not refer to the Department of Iron and Steel. It is a fact that not only the Department of Iron and Steel, but the Department of Commerce also has been indicted. If you read that report, it is such a horrible appalling document and the facts that have been churned up by this debate on this report are so strikingly and obnoxious that I think it would even put the keeper of the historical Augean stable to shame.

It has been remarked in some place in the 50th Report that this group of firms Aminchand Peareylal, and not only this group of firms, but other firms are also mentioned—took the Department of Iron and Steel for granted. In this 55th Report also, if we read the other paragraphs which do not relate to the Minister himself, we shall find that the Committee itself has taken exception to the way in which the Secretary of the Department, the Iron and Steel Controller, the Deputy Controller and all such people show an extraordinary degree of solicitude in letting off this firm.

What is the background of the Aminchand Peareylal group of firms? About 20 or 21 concerns, this group of firms started business one year after independence in 1948, and along with 18 years of Congress rule, the firms not only the Aminchand Peareylal group but many other mushroom firms—when Shri Asoka Mehta was on this side of the House, when he had not crossed the floor in the previous Parliament, you remember we first heard of the newly emerging Mundhra group —have come up as the financial carpet-baggers of the post-independence period, people who have just flourished on the backing of the Government, who have wormed their way into all departments of the administration, wherever there is any opportunity of making quick money, cheap money by flouting laws, by fraudulent dealings, by all kinds of illegal deals.

By your ruling, we are precluded from referring to the 50th Report. But over page of it makes reference to these things. Unless this whole system goes, unless the Government can take a solemn resolve that they will do away with this system, resignation of one Mr. Subramaniam or of any other Minister will not do. The Government has to make a firm declaration that from this day onward they will take note of all the strictures that have been passed not only by the 50th report of the PAC not only by the 55th report, but by all other similar committees and they shall put an end to the circumstances that gave rise to those strictures. What about the strictures passed by the Public Undertakings Committee about the working of the same department i.e., the Department of Iron and Steel. I make that appeal not so much to the Government, because I think it is the Government which stands in the dock today; I—am very sorry to say that it is the leadership of Mrs. Gandhi as Prime Minister that stands in the dock today before the bar of public opinion today to answer the charges of the present indictment. It is not the question of one Mr. poor Subramaniam or Swaran Singh. It is this system, this vicious system of collusion that has grown up in the course of the last 18 years that is under indictment. I appeal to the patriotism and sense of decency of the Congress Party, to the patriotic genius of the Congress Party. Will they be able to do it? I know there are men inside the Congress Party who feel intensely about these things. Otherwise we would not have been the sort of reports of the committees that we have before us. But still when it comes to the Government taking decisions on the recommendations of these Committees, on the Reports of these committees, we know how the Government party reacts. When they take a decision as a party we know how they feel about it. We have heard Shri K. C. Pant, he says, after all we have to remember that the recommendations of the PAC are merely advisory suggestions which the Government are not always bound to accept.

[Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri]

The other day the public Undertakings Committee submitted their report, and in that report they expressed their extreme dissatisfaction about the scant regard which is paid by various Government departments and the Ministries concerned about the recommendations; in many cases these recommendations are not carried out in time, are not heeded to, and the system that has grown up to which I was referring goes on flourishing merrily. That is the way that the Government takes a decision on the PAC recommendations.

As yet we do not know whether you would hold the substitute motions that have been moved by this side or the other side are in order. But speaking for myself, I would even be prepared to accept the substitute motion of Mr. Pant. Let there be an enquiry in terms of the recommendations of the 50th report of the PAC, let there be an enquiry by a three-man high power committee, it should not be a high level Committee but a high powered committee, whose decisions should be binding upon the Government. That committee should go not only into the case of any dereliction from the path of rectitude by Mr. Subramaniam or Swaran Singh, but the whole set of officers, the Secretariesfi Joint Secretaries, Controllers, Deputy Controllers, all these people. I ask every Hon'ble Member to read between the lines of the report. It is so very open that after eighteen years of independence these high officials—it is not merely clerks or some class three officials—who did these things. The whole set of Controllers, Joint Controllers, Import and Export Controllers, Directors, Secretaries, and joint secretaries—these people are thick in collusion with these newly rich capitalist firms that have flourished in the post-independence period. Their collusion with these dishonest businessmen has corrupted the people who occupy the treasury benches, whether the present set of ministers or any previous set of ministers; they are all guilty men. I again make an appeal not to the Government, not so much to the Prime Minister; I appeal to the patriotic genius and public spirit of the Congress party. I belive that even now there is enough of patriotism left in the Congress party and if the Congress party rises to the occasion, then perhaps this 18 years of accumulation of filth, corruption, bribery and nepotism may yet be swept away. Otherwise, God help us.

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): Mr. Speaker, I have sought your permission to explain something which has been said personally about me by some hon. Members directly and by others indirectly and I will confine myself only to the relevant part namely, that relevant to the 55th report. The question was posed very cleverly by Mr. Madhu Limaye; with a view to escape his own responsibility he framed the questions thus: whether then Jit Pal one of the partners of the firm sought an interview with Mr. Subramaniam, I was present with the representative of the firm. When somebody pointed out that he was making an insinuation, he said: I am only seeking information. I would like to give that information. Unfortunately Mr. Limaye is not here. There was absolutely no basis for his framing the question in the manner he did. It is amazing he should have repeated that question when my colleague Mr. Subramaniam categorically stated in the PAC where the question was put whether any of his colleagues ever approached him or went with that partner to Mr. Subramaniam, that it was absolutely incorrect and no colleague of his had ever approached him or had intervened on behalf of that firm. It is unfortunate that Mr. Madhu Limaye should have thought it fit to repeat it gain although it came from him in the form of a question for eliciting information. I strongly repudiate that. It is an insinuation which is entirely incorrect. I am sorry he should have made such an insinuation. I left this Ministry in 1962 and

many colleagues in Parliament here have now sought to raise several points some directly and some indirectly concerning me, some whispering sort of campaign has been afoot. I would like to say that no such thing was every suggested, when I was in charge of it from 1957 to 62. 4½ years later they are unearthing all that and that shows that this was timed when all this mudslinging goes on. I take full responsibility for whatever happened in the Steel Ministry from 1957 to 1962. I do not claim infallibility; I might have passed incorrect orders or hasty orders and as a Minister I am responsible for them, if they are wrong or hasty. It pains me most to find that irresponsible statements and insinuations are made against the person of the Minister without taking adequate steps to verify the correctness of these and it has become the fashion here under the garb of privilege to hurl all these insinuations which I strongly repudiate.

Shri Morarka: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to you and to the House for the very kind words that hon. Members had to say about the functioning of the Public Accounts Committee. It is really heartening to see the reception that this Committee's reports have received.

I have ventured to speak and take a few minutes of the House because there are few things which I feel only a Member of the PAC can say. One point which I wanted to make clear and remove the misgivings in the House is that so far as this Committee is concerned, it gets the fullest co-operation from the Government in the form of receiving information. There have been occasions when our Committee has asked for the most confidential information and even though the officers have hesitated, the Ministers, when it was brought to their notice, have hastened to supply the information including some confidential reports or files to the Chairman and to the Committee.

Secondly, about the recommendations of our Committee, the hon. Member, Shri Khadilkar, who has just spoken, said that about 90 per cent of the recommendations are accepted. I would go a little further than that and say that almost 95 to 98 per cent of the recommendations are accepted by the Government, and the Government gives all the due consideration that the recommendations of the Committee deserve. But then, there is something wrong with our system: even though all the recommendations are accepted and are implemented, yet, year after year, you would find that the same type of mistakes are being repeated and the same type of loss is incurred in respect of the public money. (*Interruption*).

To give you an example, take this very case which is under consideration. More than 15 years have passed since this party came on the scene. During these 15 years, the Committee is left with the impression that this party had played very sharp tricks on the Government; they have taken very unfair advantage from the Government and the officers. During this period of 15 years, what happened. Five Cabinet Ministers changed; four Secretaries changed; five Iron and Steel Controllers changed. There have been occasions when this firm was put on the black list for not less than three or four times. If you take the Public Accounts Committee's reference to the performance of this firm, this firm was mentioned for nine times. Then there have been innumerable occasions when its offices, etc. have been raided by the SPE and searched. Inspite of that, it required the Public Accounts Committee and this Parliament to take up this matter and to bring all these things to the notice of the people.

The hon. Minister of External Affairs Shri Swaran Singh, just now said that he left the Ministry four and a half years ago. It is quite true it is not possible for the Minister to know all the orders or to see all the things but then the general view is that some firms are getting very unfair

[Shri Swaran Singh]

advantage of the Government, that they are prospering, and every time they get away with whatever they do. Take the example of customs, the example of export promotion; the example of industrial licences. All these things are there. But I will not go into the details, because our Committee has recommended that another Committee should be appointed, and when that Committee comes into existence, I am sure it will do the needful.

While I welcome the decision of the Government whole-heartedly for the appointment of a Committee of Enquiry I must say one thing. The persons whom this Committee is going to deal with are very powerful people. The Jit Pal group, the Ramkishan Kulwantrai group, the Khemchand Rajkumar group plus many others are very powerful people, and they have got friends everywhere. My request to the hon. Prime Minister is that when they appoint the Committee, it must ensure that they have in their Committee people who cannot be approached by anyone. Otherwise, the very purpose of this Committee and the desire on the part of the Government to have a clean stable would be defeated.

Our reports are unanimous as well as anonymous. They are unanimous in the sense that all the members agree with the ultimate findings. We never have a minute of dissent or difference of opinion. Even if we have to spend one day more, we rather spend it and iron out the difference. They are anonymous in the sense that as far as possible, we do not mention the names of any officer or minister in the report. These are healthy traditions which have been well laid down..

Our reports are always restrained and on the side of moderation. These particular reports have received a lot of public attention. So far as other reports which have been equally important from the point of view of public finance and safeguarding public revenue are concerned, if at all they suffer from anything, they only suffer from moderation and restraint.

In England, from 1961, they have started discussing the PAC reports every year. One day in a year is given for that. At that time, they do not discuss a particular report. Any report or all the reports of the PAC are discussed. The motion is moved by the Chairman himself and whosoever want to take part in the discussion, they do so. They do not discuss the findings of the committee. They try to discuss the follow-up action on the reports and try to plead with the Government as to why there is any delay or how that follow-up action should be taken. It is made very clear in the very beginning that a debate on that occasion is not a confrontation between the opposition and the ruling party, but it is well laid down that it is a confrontation between the House of Commons on the one hand and the executive wing of the Government on the other. In the same way, here also this report is not a party affair at all. It has not been discussed on a party basis. I am only sorry for some of the remarks made by Mr. Dixit, who had unfortunately an inadequate appreciation of the findings of our committee. I would illustrate this with reference to only one point. He said that if a minister passes an order blacklisting a firm, he has to consult all other ministries. Without consulting them, he cannot pass it.

Shri G. N. Dixit: I said in two clauses it required the concurrence of the Home Ministry and in two clauses it required the concurrence of administrative ministry.

Shri Morarka: I may assure him that our committee has gone into every word of the blacklisting code for three days before we came to this finding. The difference between blacklisting and banning is this. If a

firm is blacklisted, no department of the Government is permitted to deal with that firm. If there is an order banning dealings with a firm, it is open to the other departments of the Government to deal with or not to deal with that firm. An order of banning is not a mandatory order. But an order of blacklisting is a mandatory order. Once a firm is blacklisted, for that period during which the firm is so blacklisted, no department of the Government is permitted to deal with that firm. In any case, I thought there was no dispute about the facts. All the facts are admitted. The wording of that order is admitted. The minister himself, who appeared before us, said that it was his intention and he had reduced the rigour of the order. I do not know why Mr. Dixit has unnecessarily laboured on that point.

Sir, before I sit down, I would like to mention only one thing, that the Public Accounts Committee wants to express publicly its thanks to the Auditor-General, from whom we received considerable assistance, and also the Secretariat of the Lok Sabha without whose such able assistance our work could not have been so fruitful.

Shri G. N. Dixit: Sir, Shri Morarka has referred to my speech, and on that point I only want to say this much, that what I said was that the Minister's black-listing order was in violation of the provisions of the code. I have looked into those provsions. I would request Shri Morarka to look into them, examine them and then he will be of the same view. I will discuss it with him and then he will agree with me.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (देवास) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस विषय पर बोलते हुए माननीय सदस्य, श्री खाडिलकर ने कहा कि इस प्रस्ताव को सदन में लाने के पीछे विरोधी पक्ष का मूल उद्देश्य चुनाव में लाभ उठाना है। मैं उन से यह पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या वह सच्चाई को दबा कर चुनाव में उसका लाभ उठाना चाहते हैं।

श्री सुब्रह्मण्यम् को मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि उनको एक नई परम्परा डालनी चाहिए। जब पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी ने श्री देशमुख के विषय में कुछ लिखा था और उन पर आरोप लगाये थे, तो उन्होंने इस्तीफा दे दिया। जब भारत सेवक समाज पर कुछ आरोप लगाये गये, तो श्री नन्दा ने उसके चेयरमैन के पद से इस्तीफा दे दिया, हालांकि उन्होंने कोई गबन नहीं किया था। उस आलोचना के बाद श्री नन्दा ने उस पद पर रहना अच्छा नहीं समझा। अगर उस परम्परा का पालन करते हुए श्री सुब्रह्मण्यम् भी इस्तीफा दे देते, तो अच्छा होता, लेकिन उन्होंने तो अपनी सीट पर चिपके रहने की परम्परा डाली है। अगर वह आरम्भ में ही अपने पद से इस्तीफा दे देते, तो इतने तथ्य सामने न आ पाते। इस दृष्टि से यह अच्छा ही हुआ है।

Shri K. C. Sharma (Sardhana): He can discuss the report; not the Minister.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय: मंत्री महोदय ने जांच समिति बनाने के बारे में कहा है। वह तो होना ही चाहिए। परन्तु उनके इस पद पर रहते हुए इस बारे में जांच नहीं होनी चाहिए। उनको पहले इस्तीफा देना चाहिए और फिर इस विषय में जांच होनी चाहिए। जिन मंत्रियों के कारण देश और जनता के धन की हानि हुई है, उनसे वह सारे का सारा धन वसूल करना चाहिए। उनको वही सजा मिलनी चाहिए, जो कि देशद्रोही को मिलनी चाहिए। पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी की रिपो पर अमल करते हुए उन मंत्रियों को अपने पद से इस्तीफा दे देना चाहिए, जिन पर आरोप लगाये गये हैं।

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Raj Bahadur): Sir, Shri Madhu Limaye had ad-

[Shri Raj Bahadur]

dressed two questions to me. I just want to say a word about them. In reply to his question about the statement made by Shri Subramaniam before the P. A. C. I have to refer to Shri Subramaniam's statement of 1-8-66 in which he had reproduced verbatim the relevant noting on the file of the Steel Ministry, I may say that that substantially states the position correctly and I have nothing to add.

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरे प्रश्न का जवाब दीजिये, नहीं तो कहिये कि मुझे जवाब नहीं देना है। वह नोट तो मैंने पढ़ा है। मैंने दूसरा ही प्रश्न पूछा है।

Shri Raj Bahadur: Sir, I have to reply in my own words, in my own language. I have said, that whatever has been stated in this relevant noting reproduced verbatim in the statement of Shri Subramaniam states the position correctly. So far as the other questions about complaints against the Apejay Shipping company is concerned, so far as I know, there might be some complaints, but I am not aware of them at the present moment.

18 hrs.

Shri C. Subramaniam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, at the outset I should express my unhappiness that I should have been the cause for this discussion and the setting up of new precedents. It has been a matter of considerable pain to me personally. But, that apart, I would like to place before this House a few facts. Even with regard to the 55th Report, I thought in your ruling on the privilege motion you had brought out the relevant aspects. The 55th Report contains two chapters. I thought the Chairman would, in all fairness, refer to that. The first chapter was finalised before my examination and it is there. The word "obscure" is used and various other words are used. After my examination, as far as the reasons for changing the order are concerned, they have taken note of the two reasons I had given and have also stated that I have agreed that on the facts available to them at the time of the Fiftieth Report they were justified in making those remarks, and, as was expected of them, they have not given whether those reasons, were good, bad or indifferent; that is a different thing altogether, and that is what the House is discussing now.

After I took over in April 1962, I, in my own way, tried to bring about a new orientation in steel control. I am sure the House is aware that in September 1962 I appointed what is known as the K. N. Raj Committee and their recommendations were implemented on 29-2-64. I made a statement before Parliament on 2-6-64. If that report of the Committee is read, and also my statement before Parliament, I am sure members would realise a new pattern was set up in the steel control so that all those abuses could be reduced to the minimum. While it was not possible for us to de-control all items, we went as far as possible and set up, what is now know as the Joint Plan Committee for the purpose of planning the production and distribution with regard to a majority of the items. Only in respect of items which were in short supply, particularly flat products and other critical items, we retained the control, and even there we tried to reduce the abuses, as far as possible. Therefore, as somebody was pointing out, I in my own way tried to change the system and bring about a new order. It is not only changing of the system that is important. I also attached importance to bringing about new attitudes among those who are dealing with iron and steel. It is with that aspect I passed various orders.

There has naturally been some comment with regard to the toning down of an order. The only thing I would like to place before the House is this. This is a matter which happened three or four years back and, therefore, it is only on recollection that I would be able to say what happened, apart from what is appearing in

the records. The records cannot go wrong. My recollections or my memory may sometimes get adjusted to what is suitable for me but, as far as records are concerned, they cannot go wrong. Therefore, my whole approach to the examination of this problem is to look into the records and see whether there were sufficient reasons or not.

What is important is on the 20th I have seen a representative of the firm and on the 22nd the gist of the interview is reduced to writing and it has been sent to me. Now, the point for consideration is this, whether anything improper happened during this interview, as is being hinted at. If that were so, the easiest thing for me to do is not to talk about that meeting at all. On the other hand, I took it on record, the endorsements of that meeting. I wanted this to come into the records. That itself shows that it was not my intention to hide this interview. On the other hand, I wanted this to go on record, and it is there.

Another aspect I would like to place before the House is this. I think Shri Madhu Limaye put that question about my assurances with regard to future undertakings.

Apart from my recollection, if you go through the Report, the stand I have taken is that instead of indulging itself in speculation trade and all those things, it is better to have legitimate production programme and in that—naturally in any legitimate activity—Government would be prepared to help anybody. It is from that point of view that that statement was made and that is there.

If you go through the second part of the letter, I do not want to be reading it again, the attitude which I have taken with reference to this firm would show that if there was anything improper or any improper pressure to which I was yielding, certainly I could not have taken the attitude I had taken in that interview. It is brought out in that letter, their assurance that they would keep to the highest standards which I had indicated to them. If I was succumbing to some improper pressure, they should have been aware of it because they should have been the parties to have it. Then could I take that attitude when I talked to them that you had misbehaved, caused annoyance to me, and should keep to standards? This is the thing which you will have to bear in mind.

As to whether I was justified in changing that order or not, as I have already stated, it is a question, as far as I was concerned to see that action was taken not only to change the system but to make the individuals also to change their attitude. If I saw a change in the attitude, as was exhibited in the letter written to me, is it wrong that I take an attitude that here are people who had all along been misbehaving but who accept the mistake and would see that hereafter they would behave properly? It is not as if they can run away from that; I can watch that also. Under those circumstances, if I bring down the rigour of the order to a certain extent—might be my vanity might have been tickled by their falling flat and saying, "Hereafter we are prepared to behave properly"; that apart—I respectfully submit that there is nothing wrong in it. After all, as has been pointed out by somebody, as far as trade is concerned, it is mainly the steel trade that they have got and as far as the steel trade is concerned, I still had the hold and I had not changed the order. Therefore it is from that point of view that I would like the House to consider it.

I agree, somebody else might come to a different view; prhaps, I myself in a different atmosphere might also have taken a different view.

Shri Ranga: In a different atmosphere.

Shri C. Subramaniam: I am saying about the mental attitude; therefore, the hon. Member just need not catch a phrase and try to exploit it.

Therefore that is the point which will have to be taken into consideration. If under these circumstances I changed the rigour of the order, can there be any *mala fides* involved in it?

I am grateful to all the hon. Members that whatever else they might have said they did not attribute *mala fides* in the sense that I took money or that there was any other improper thing.

Sir, I have been a minister for nearly 15 years now and in my own way I have tried to present to the country a clean record of service. It is not that I claim perfection. Who can claim perfection? I do not claim perfection, but I have endeavoured to the extent possible to present a clean record to the country. I am not prepared to say that I would not have erred here and there, but on the whole I can claim that I have presented a clean record in the service of the country not only after freedom but even before freedom also for the attainment of freedom. That is the only claim I make, but in spite of that if the House takes a different view, I know, I have to bow to the view of the House because I attach great importance to what Members think, not only Members on my side but what Members on the other side think. I can assure the hon. Members that I attach great importance to them because once my *bona fides* are doubted even by the Opposition, certainly I cannot function as a minister. I do realise it. Therefore I attach great importance as far as my *bona fides* are concerned. I do not mind political attacks against me, but if my *bona fides* are attacked, naturally to that extent I am weakened with reference to my functioning as a minister. I am quite well aware of it. I will not ignore that aspect, I would like to say.

Then, another question was put by Shri Madhu Limaye whether Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon was present. I wish I am in a position to give a categorical answer with reference to this. This question was put in the form of a short notice question, I think, also. As a matter of fact, I can say as far as my colleague, Shri Swaran Singh, is concerned, that he never used to visit my house except on some formal occasions; therefore, I can categorically say about him that he was not there. As far as Kairon is concened, he used to come and see me. Whether in this connection he came and saw me or not, I tried to go through all the records, I tried to get some clue, but I am sorry to say that I have not been able to get any clue. As far as my recollection goes, I am not able to recollect whether he was present or not. That is the only thing I would say. Even if he were present—it is not as if cases are not brought to my notice by others; hon. Members bring various cases to my notice; my colleagues bring cases to my notice—does that mean political pressure? Whatever it might be, I do not want to drag dead men into the picture, they can neither corraborate nor contradict. I take the full responsibility for the orders I have passed and, therefore, if I have gone wrong, I will have to pay the penalty for that. But I do claim that I have not done anything wrong in this case. That is all I can put before the House. Therefore, it is from that point of view that I would like even the Opposition Members to look at it. It is not, in any way, intending to show extenuating circumstances that I place this before the House. Still as a Minister responsible to this House, as a Minister who has to function in this House with the Opposition and with my own Party, I think, I should place these facts before the House and I am sure, not that they shou'd accept what I have said, they would also give some consideration to the points which I have placed

before the House. I know Mr. Daji is very angry or somebody else is very angry. But that is completely different. I would only appeal to them to give some thought to the point of view which I have placed before them and if they think there is something in that also, I would only appeal to them to give some weight to it in making judgment as far as I am concerned.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have not very much more to say because most of the points have been met. I should like to express my deep appreciation of the guidance which you have given to this debate. It is because of that I feel hon. Members have used a considerable restraint and this has not been the mud-slinging session which we had expected, and for that I am grateful to you and also to the hon. Members opposite.

I should like to assure the House and, I think, I have done so on previous occasions also, that I am second to none in supporting the view that all those who are guilty or corrupt should be punished for their actions. I assure the House that I shall not give protection to any such people. But, at the same time, I do have the responsibility to see that there is no sort of witch-hunting or general allegations which lead to a situation where the administration is paralysed.

I am referring now not only to the remarks that were made about Ministers but even what was earlier said about our civil servants and officials. They are not in the House to defend themselves. Yet they do bear a heavy responsibility in the Government of the country. It is possible that some of them may not be upto standard; it is possible that some of them may be corrupt or incompetent. But, I think the sort of sweeping generalisations, as are sometimes made from the Opposition Benches, are unfortunate and far from cleaning up the service. I think, they do a great deal of harm because this only results in delays which lead again to greater corruption and complications.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Read the Das Commission's Report.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: By and large, I think our administrative service has a high reputation not only in our country but also in the view of experts who come and look at it from abroad. So, I would only say that we do not want to do anything which would create a feeling of uncertainty or uneasiness in them and reduce their effectiveness because, as I said earlier, much depends on their functioning. At the same time, I would repeat what I said earlier that wherever there is anything wrong, it has to be cleaned up. I do not want wrong-doing. I do want to look under the carpet and see what is wrong, not only what is wrong on the top but also what is wrong inside.

Some hon. Members said something about the system. I agree there also that the system is responsible for a great deal; that is not as it should be. But this is something that cannot unfortunately be cleaned with one sweep. You have to look at all these things in detail and one by one. Unfortunately general remarks like those made receive so much publicity here and abroad that again action does not become easier but is made more difficult.

For the PAC we have the highest respect I had told you some time ago of the Government's decision to have the Inquiry Committee as recommended in the PAC's report. At that time it was somehow felt that we should not make this announcement and, therefore, we did not say anything about it. Later—I think it was on the 12th August—the Minister of Iron and Steel conveyed this decision in writing to the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. This Committee will go into all matters and when their findings are before me, I shall certainly see that appropriate action on the basis of the Committee's recommendations is taken. More than that, the House will obviously not expect me to say at this stage and indeed it will be contrary to the accepted propriety to do so.

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

There is sometimes a tendency to jump to conclusions that, because some matters are before the Committee of Inquiry, the people concerned are necessarily guilty. It is perhaps this kind of presumption that creates resistance to inquiry but, as I said, we have taken the decision.

Now it is significant that the 55th Report does not contain any recommendation for any specific action; I do not think it casts any doubt about the *bona fides* of my colleague, Mr. Subramaniam. He has explained the position in the House on several occasions and you, Mr. Speaker, were yourself pleased to rule that he had not committed any breach of privilege. I was impressed by the fact that many Opposition speakers, who were severely critical, did not suggest any dishonourable motives for the Minister's revision of his order. Judgment in such matters, as he himself has said, is necessarily subjective in character and it is possible that the reasons for such a judgment may seem obscure after a lapse of time.

In the light of what I have said, I hope that all hon. members will agree to withdraw the various substitute motions.

There is one thing which I forgot to mention; it is that the ban which Mr. Subramaniam had placed continues on this firm. When it was extended to cover other areas with which this firm is concerned, the firm has gone to court and a stay order on Government has been issued.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Apprehensions of members that the discussion would lead to unsatisfactory situation, I think, have been removed after the discussion that we have had. It has served a very useful purpose; different points of view have been placed before the House. I am very grateful especially to the Ministers who intervened and placed their points of view. But I cannot understand the statement that the Prime Minister has made. In the name of, as she calls it, 'witch-hunting', they always try to shield the corrupt ministers, officials and corruption. I would have been happy if she had made a forthright announcement here that they accept the recommendation and the Committee that is going to be proposed would be a Committee under the Commission of Inquiry Act; a public inquiry would be held and all those matters that have been emphasized by every speaker and all that comes in connection with these deals would be inquired into by the Commission. We would also have been very happy if she could have indicated the names of the persons who would hold this inquiry, because the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee himself has pointed out that this company and the persons who are connected with it are very powerful, and, therefore, Government must be very careful in selecting the persons. So, it would have been better if the names of the persons who would hold the inquiry could also have been given to us.

Shri C. Subramaniam has explained himself. I do not want to go into the details again. But the two specific points which I had made still remain. There is no reply to them. My first point was whether any letter was received—I had quoted the number and the date—in regard to these deals from Shri Pratap Singh Kairon which was mentioned in connection with the Das Commission inquiry. He has remained silent on that. I thought that he would have searched his files and would have told us that there was no such letter, but that has not been stated.

Again, look at the change of the order. It is not so innocent. He takes some credit for the order of November, 1962. Why did that happen? The occasion arose because Ramakrishna Kulwant Rai had committed some action and some irregularities. If you go through these reports, you will find one very significant thing in regard to the changes that have been made as a

result of the changes in the orders. A list has been given at page 90 of the 50th report of the companies belonging to the Aminchand Pyarelal Group, who have been suspended, banned or black-listed for different periods; but you will find that in that list, the name of Ramakrishna Kulwant Rai does not appear. That means that during that period when there was a general ban or suspension or blacklisting, that firm had continued to have the same business of import, export etc. with the support of the Steel Ministry and the Iron and Steel Controller.

As regards the offence that Shri C. Subramaniam has committed, whether he has done anything *mala fide*, whether he has derived any pecuniary benefit out of it and so on, I have made my point very clear. But the fact remains that the effect of the order has been that these malpractices have continued and this group of industries has been given these facilities to continue their business as they were doing it before. This, I think, has been a great blunder. More than the question whether it is *bona fide* or not, I think there is no excuse so far as this act of his is concerned. I think he will really be establishing a good tradition in this country, and it will be a lesson to his officers and it will be a lesson to all in this country for future Ministers, if because of this mistake of his, he quits office.

Lastly, I would like the House to remember one thing, and that is about the Santhanam Committee's recommendations. Why are all these things taking place in this country? Why are we bringing these things to notice? It is no pleasure for us to bring these matters to the notice of the House. The Prime Minister was concerned over the fact that whatever was said here was published all over the world. After all, we are all doing things openly. So, why should Government be afraid of it? Even worse things have been published. Why are they afraid of the misdeeds of the administration being publicised or exposed? I think they ought to be exposed. What is there to hide and conceal about them? How can these things be concealed? We can never conceal them but be exposing them in Parliament which is a forum available for that purpose, I think we are establishing a good tradition showing to the world how democracy should correct these mistakes. So, it is no good concealing these things. It has happened, and it has happened in such a manner that today large numbers of our countrymen feel that this Government is completely under the influence of and working under a pressure from big business, corrupt officials etc.

The Home Ministry under the leadership of the late Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri had appointed the Santhanam Committee. If those recommendations had been accepted, I may tell you that there would have been no occasion for such things to occur.

There is one particular recommendation of the Santhanam Committee which I would like to bring to the notice of the House. I do not wish to go into details but I shall read out only the recommendation which reads thus:

> "Nothing but a total ban on all donations by corporate bodies to political parties will clear the atmosphere.".

As a result of this discussion, if Government decide that by law, they will ban all donations by corporate bodies to political parties, no matter whether it is the Congress or Swatantra parties, then I think some purpose will be served by this Motion. I hope Government will accept it.

Mr. Speaker: May I again repeat my request that now that the whole debate is over, the purpose has been served, the consequences would follow, we might not pursue those substitute motions?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Before that, may I seek a clarification from the Prime Minister, that is, whether in

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

response to the proposal made by my hon. colleague, Shri Dwivedy, Government accept our demand for a Commission of Inquiry which will be a public inquiry? If Government accept that, we will certainly consider that request?

Shri Ranga: Unless it s a Commission of Inquiry, it will be rendered nugatory and useless.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: A public inquiry.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I assure the House that the personnel of the Committee will be of the kind which will give confidence to the House.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय क्या मंत्री महोदय पद पर बने रहेंगे ।

Mr. Speaker: Is the Prime Minister in a position to say at this moment whether that would be a Commission of Inquiry?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: And a public inquiry?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: No. .... (*Interruptions*).

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is a shameful stand they are taking, an unworthy stand. Guilty conscience.

Mr. Speaker: I am not concerned with that.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Why is she afraid of a Commission of Inquiry?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Her father had done it before in the case of the Mundhra deal. Let her emulate his example.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I am not afraid of anything, but as I said, we have accepted the recommendation of the PAC in their report.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: This must be spelt out.

Shri Ranga: The PAC had to work under pressure . . . . (*Interruptions*). I am using the word calculatedly and advisedly. You remember we had taken objection to the Minister appearing before the PAC. Then the Minister said that he did not wish to exercise any pressure. Therefore I had that word in mind. I cannot forget it.

I have also been Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. I know under what circumstances the Public Accounts Committee makes its recommendations. But now it is not the province of the Public Accounts Committee any longer. This House has taken possession of this problem and is seized of this question. We have discussed it for a whole day and therefore, we must be satisfied that what the Government want to do would be a satisfactory thing. Earlier, under different auspices, they thought a Committee would be enough. But now that is not enough. We want a Commission of Inquiry under the Commission of Inquiry Act with the legal right to summon and examine witnesses.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I take it it is the unanimous view of the Opposition that the matter should be gone into by a Commission of Inquiry and if Government has the slightest interest in behaving properly on this issue, it must accept it.

अध्यक्ष महोदय: श्री बनर्जी ।

श्री मधु लिमये : पहले मेरा है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं ने श्री बनर्जी को बुलाया है, आपको भी सुनूंगा ।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I would like to mention here what we want. My substitute motion says:

"This House, having considered the 55th Report of the Public Ac-

counts Committee recommends to Government that a Commission headed by a Supreme Court Judge be appointed to investigate into the whole deal".

We want a Commission to be constituted under the Commission of Inquiry Act with a Supreme Court Judge to be associated with it. We have made this suggestion only because we want to defend our glorious tradition in the past. There was only a memorandum against Shri T. T. Krishnamathari and he resigned. We should have an inquiry commission, we will press for it.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने कहा था कि आप मुझे बुलायेंगे ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : किस चीज पर आप बोलना चाहते हैं ?

श्री मधु लिमये : अभी जो प्रधान मंत्री जी ने और सुब्रह्मण्यम् साहब ने हम को अपील की है . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उसके ऊपर जो रिएकशन था अपोजीशन ने बता दिया है ।

श्री मधु लिमये : ऐसा कैसे हो सकता है ? मैं अपने प्रस्ताव को प्रेस करता हूं ।

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Limaye's substitute motion.

Shri A. C. Guha: May I say a word? I think the first issue to be decided is whether any substantive motion should be moved.

Mr. Speaker: I have to put the question now. If they do not agree, what can I do?

Shri Raghunath Singh: There should be no substitute motion.

Shri A. C. Guha: I want to know whether any substantive motion on the PAC report should be allowed or not.

Mr. Speaker: It is not my sphere.

Shri Tyagi: It is the sphere of the House.

Shri A. C. Guha: Let a convention be established with the consent of the House. And you can give definite directive or ruling on this.

Mr. Speaker: Can Mr. Dixit point out any rule?

Shri Tyagi: It is the privilege of the House. . . . (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: I am putting those that would be in order; others I will disallow, why should he be impatient?

Shri Tyagi: It is the privilege of the House to formulate rules about its procedure. I propose in connection with the discussions of any report of the PAC there should be no amendment or no proposals, it should be only discussed.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Not only PAC, of any other parliamentary committee.

Shri A. C. Guha: That was your advice.

Shri Madhu Limaye: On a point of order.

Shri G. M. Dixit: You should decide the admissibility of the motions. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: All must sit down first.

Shri Tyagi: In all humility I beg to submit before the House that difficulties will arise because the PAC or the Estimates Committee are elected by the single transferrable vote; if their unanimous recommendations are discussed here and there is division, the question will arise whether there should be loyalty to the Committee or to the respective parties. That will be most embarrassing. I therefore suggest that we might introduce a rule that whenever such committee's re-

[Shri Tyagi]

commendations are discussed, there will be no motion on that.

Shri Raghunath Singh: That was your suggestion also in the beginning.

Shri G. N. Dixit: I submit you were pleased to observe that you would decide the admissibility of these substitute motions. My submission is this, that you in your wisdom have allowed the discussion of this Committee's report. There is no rule, but you have got power and in the exercise of that power, as a very special case, for the first time, as you said, after freedom, you have allowed this discussion. Therefore, it is entirely up to you to restrict either the discussion as you restricted or the substitute motions or the voting, and therefore, really speaking, it is entirely your job, your duty, your charge to take a decision on the point of admissibility, and not of the House, and therefore I submit it will be creating a good tradition if you take a decision.

Shri Raghunath Singh: The House should formulate a rule according to your suggestion that no parliamentary committee's report should be discussed here. They are elected by parliament, and it will be a vote of no confidence against them.

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। विनती करने का जैसा प्रधान मंत्री जी को और सुब्रह्मण्यम साहब को अधिकार है उससे ज्यादा अधिकार आपको है। आपने विनती की है . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बोल चुके हैं।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर पर बोल रहा हूं। यह हमारा जो वैकल्पिक प्रस्ताव है, जो सबस्टीट्यूट मोशन है, यह पेश हो चुका है। यह नियमों के अनुसार है। अब क्वेश्चन भी आप पुट कर रहे थे। उसके सम्बन्ध में जो नियम हैं उनकी ओर मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूं . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जब मैं पुट करने जा रहा था तब माननीय सदस्यों ने आपत्तियां उठाईं

श्री मधु लिमये : आप क्वेश्चन पुट करेंगे तो मैं बैठ जाऊंगा।

Shri Dandeker (Gonda): Sir, I agree with Mr. Tyagi that reports of the PAC ought never to be the subject of approval or disapproval; it would be a dreadful thing if they, too, become matters of approval or disapproval, or matters of party politics; the rat will then go right down into these Committees. The consequences would be very serious. I, therefore, submit that it should not be the subject of voting.

Shri Nambiar: I may submit that this unfortunate thing can be avoided provided from the other side they accept the commission of enquiry, a public enquiry under the Commission of Enquiry Act. Then, the Opposition is prepared to withdraw all these amendments and substitute motions. That is the only way.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Mr. Nambiar was absolutely right in suggesting that if only the response from the Government was anything like that, we would never have pressed for the substitute motion. The fact remains that this is the most extra-ordinary discussion which you have permitted because of an extra-ordinary situation having arisen and that having taken place, we have to make up our mind and because the Government side had provoked us and has refused to offer a Commission of Enquiry, we are driven to this position. It is no good quoting the British precedent in part; it is no good believing in your saying: heads I win, tails you lose. The PAC in UK is headed by a member of the opposition while in this country they have never followed that kind of precedent. When it is to their advantage they want to take the British precedent that the PAC report could never be

discussed except in a particular way. Since we have discussed this matter and since there are certain rights inherent in Parliament and we have taken notice of it and as Mr. Ranga said a little while ago we are in possession of this matter, it has gone beyond the PAC and the House has also made it clear in substitute motions categorically that we are entirely behind it and applaud the report of the PAC; there is not the slightest suggestion of disrespect to the PAC. It is only because of our indignation at Government's trying to shield and whitewash people who have perhaps made very indecent gains in this matter, it is only because of that we are driven into asking for a vote on the substitute motion.

Shri A. C. Guha: Repeatedly, it was decided by the Speaker that there should not be any discussion about reports of the PAC or of the Estimates Committee. I would like to recall here a relevant quotation from a speech by Shri Ayyangar while he was Speaker. In the course of his address, he said:

> "If after the presentation of the report a discussion is allowed on the report, a minister who may not see eye to eye with the committee will gather support on the general principles, on political grounds and on such an issue being raised in an acute form the usefulness of the report will be nullified."

A discussion has been held and it is only that the report may be discussed. But if you allow any vote to be taken on any substitute motion, the House will be divided. It is a report of the House; there cannot be any division of the House on its own report; there cannot be any vote or any substitute motion. That should be as a basic principle and not conditions demanded by the Members and agreed to by the Government. . . . (*Interruptions*).

Shri S. K. Patil: Mr. Speaker, this particular amendment the contents of which were read out just now applauds and approves what the PAC has done. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, if this amendment is voted down, it means that we are casting a slur on the working of the PAC.

Shri Madhu Limaye: Why vote it down?

Shri S. K. Patil: You have to listen . . . . It will cast a slur on those who voted against that proposition because we have no choice. It has always been held in our legislatures that approval carries with it also the chance for disapproval, if it gets defeated. Therefore, when we have made a suggestion, it is not on the merits whether the report is good or bad. If we start the practice of approving a report, it also means that there may be some who may disapprove of that report also. . . . (*Interruptions.*) I do not take your opinion. The substitute motion is in a different category; there are other substitute motions that have been raised. The actual motion here says that we applaud and approve of that report. If you put it to vote and if it is voted down, it would mean that those who have voted it down have no respect for the decision of the PAC. Therefore, whatever might be the conditions, you will be bound to hold that this amendment is strictly out of order. (*Interruption*).

An hon. Member: What is the assurance?

Shri S. K. Patil: Assurance has nothing to do with this motion.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, पायंट आफ़ आर्डर है । क्या पी० ए० सी० की रिपोर्ट कोई पार्टी मैटर है ?

Dr. M. S. Aney: The rules say that the motion on the PAC report will not be voted upon at all. The particular motion before the House will certainly give rise to the possibility of another opposite motion being

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

brought here. So, that should not be taken into consideration. Let the report of the PAC be taken as final and it should not be put to the vote at all.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह प्रस्ताव है और प्रस्ताव सम्बन्धी जितने नियम हैं, वे लागू होते हैं । अगर ये चाहते हैं कि इन नियमों में इस वक्त के लिए परिवर्तन किया जाये, तो इनके सामने एक ही प्रक्रिया है, जिसका मैं डट कर विरोध करूंगा । वह प्रक्रिया है नियम 388 के अन्तर्गत सस्पेंशन आफ़ रूल्ज । और कोई रास्ता नहीं है । अगर ये ऐसा करना चाहते हैं, तो इसको आजादी है । ये बहुमत के द्वारा ऐसा कर सकते हैं, लेकिन अगर मैं अकेला भी रहूं तो भी मैं इसका विरोध करूंगा ।

मैं आप का ध्यान नियम 388 की ओर खींचना चाहता हूं, जो इस प्रकार है :

"388. Suspension of rules: Any member may, with the consent of the Speaker, move that any rule may be suspended in its application to a particular motion before the House and if the motion is carried the rule in question shall be suspended for the time being."

यदि यह नहीं होता है, तो आप को रूल 364 और 365 के अनुसार काम करना पड़ेगा, जो इस प्रकार है :

"364. A matter requiring the decision of the House shall be decided by means of a question put by the Speaker on a motion made by a member.

365. When a motion has been made the Speaker shall propose the question for consideration, and put it for the decision of the House. . . ."

आगे इसी तरह है । आप को इन नियमों के अनुसार काम करना होगा, अन्यथा रूल 388 के अतिरिक्त और कोई रास्ता नहीं है ।

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): Sir, before you call upon the Minister, I have to make a point. The discussion on this motion started at 1.35. The time allotted was five hours. Those five hours are over. So, unless the House extends the time allotted to it, nothing more can be done now.

श्री मधु लिमये : क्वेश्चन पुट हो गया है । अब क्लोजर वगैरह नहीं आ सकता है ।

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: With your permission, Sir, I would like to refer to my appeal and the request which I had made earlier when this discussion started.

My hon. friend, Shri Patil, has explained what difficulties and piquant situations would be created if the substitute motion is put to vote. As some of our friends said, in an extraordinary situation, you have allowed this motion to be discussed and we agreed to that. It should not go further.

I would appeal to the House to consider this matter dispassionately. If this precedent is established, in future it will create a lot of difficulties. Therefore, we have to weigh the two. I would, therefore, request you to suspend Rule 342 so that the House may be entitled to decide whether or not the substitute motion should be adopted.

I beg to move:

"That Rule 342 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha in its application to the substitute motions moved today to Shri Surendranath Dwivedy's motion regarding the Fifty-fifth Report of the Public Accounts Committee, be suspended."

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप के द्वारा प्रधान मंत्री जी से इस देश के जनतंत्र की रक्षा के नाम पर एक अपील

करना चाहता हूं । जैसा कि श्री त्यागी और डा० अणे ने कहा है, यह बात बिल्कुल सत्य है कि पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी की रिपोर्ट पर इस सदन में किसी प्रकार के मतदान के द्वारा हम एक बड़ी ग़लत परम्परा का श्रीगणेश करेंगे । अगर प्रधान मंत्री जी इस धर्म-संकट से बचना चाहती हैं और जनतंत्र को इस धर्म-संकट से बचाना चाहती हैं, तो उसका एक ही उपाय है । लोगों के मन में यह सन्देह व्याप्त होता जा रहा है कि चूंकि और कई व्यक्ति कमीशन आफ़ एन्क्वायरी में फंसेंगे, इसलिए उन को बचाने के लिए कमीशन आफ़ एन्क्वायरी को स्वीकार नहीं किया जा रहा है । इसलिए यदि प्रधान मंत्री जी साहस का परिचय देते हुए कमीशन आफ़ एन्क्वायरी की मांग को स्वीकार कर लें, तो देश और सरकार दोनों धर्म-संकट से बच जायेंगे ।

Shri Nambiar: That will solve the problem.

Mr. Speaker: This has been said so many times; it is for the Government.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: On a point of order, Sir. Since a motion is likely to be moved either by the Leader of the House or a member of the ruling party suspending the rule, before you consider that, I would invite your kind attention to rule 364:

> "A matter requiring the decision of the House shall be decided by means of a question put by the Speaker on a motion made by a member."

I am afraid it is too late now. That question has been put. I would appeal to you. Kindly consult the record. I would appeal to your sense of impartiality and justice. Suspension of the rule will mean the rape of democracy in this House.

Mr. Speaker: I did propose the question, but that cannot be called as putting the question. Now, if a motion has been made for the suspension of the rule, I have to attend to it.

The qustion is:

> "That Rule 342 of the Rules of Procedure. . . .

Shri Daji: Before that you must put the motion first.

श्री मधु लिमये : सस्पेंशन के प्रस्ताव पर बहस होनी चाहिए ।

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

> "That Rule 342 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha in its application to the substitute motions moved today to Shri Surendranath Dwivedy's motion regarding the Fifty-fifth Report of the Public Accounts Committee, be suspended."

Shri Daji: We will speak on this.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: This motion has come without notice and it should be held over till tomorrow. We want to have a discussion on it.

Mr. Speaker: It is not necessary for suspension of a rule. Those in favour will say 'Aye'.

Several hon. Members: 'Aye'.

Mr. Speaker: Those against will say 'No'.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: The 'Ayes' have it.

Some hon. Members: The 'Noes' have it.

Mr. Speaker: Let the lobbies be cleared. The Lobbies have been cleared.

[Mr. Speaker]

I will put the motion to the House. The question is:

"That Rule 342 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha in its application to the substitute motions moved today, to Shri Surendranath Dwivedy's motion regarding the Fifty-fifth Report of the Public Accounts Committee, be suspended."

Those in favour may say 'Aye'.

Several hon. Members: Aye

Mr Speaker: Those against may say 'No'.

There is none against now.

I think the Ayes have it. The Ayes have it; the Ayes have it The motion is carried.

The motion was adopted.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Sir, I move:

"That no substitute motion moved today to Shri Surendranath Dwivedy's motion regarding the Fifty-fifth Report of the Public Accounts Committee, be put to the vote of the House."

Shri N. Dandeker: Sir, there may be one substitute motion which I may want to be put to the vote of the House. I would like to know what the motions are which are not to be put to the House.

Shri Tyagi: I want to further suggest that the Committee for Rule-making may be entrusted with the task of looking into this issue.

Mr. Speaker: The motion now put is that no substitute motion should be put to the House. One is by Shri Madhu Limaye about approval, second one by Shri Banerjee that a Commission headed by a Supreme Court Judge be appointed, the third one is by Daji about enquiry, a fourth one by Shri Kamath urging upon the Government to appoint immediately a Commission of enquiry, and a fifth one by Shri Pant about which you have already head, about approval of Government's action, which also I did not admit.

Shri N. Dandekar: What s the way to deal fairly with this matter will it be put one by one so that I can sxpress my opinion on each of them?

Mr. Speaker: None of them is to be put.

Shri N. Dandeker: If I want to express my opinion favourably in any one case by giving my vote as a Member of the House.....

Mr. Speaker: The motion is that all these substitute motions to the motion for consideration of the PAC Report should not be put.

That is all that we are voting upon now.

The question is:

"That no substitute motion moved today, to Shri Surendranath Dwivedy's motion regarding the Fifty-fifth Report of the Public Accounts Committee, be put to the vote of the House."

Those in favour may say 'Aye'.

Several hon. Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: Those against will say 'No'.

I think the Ayes have it. The Ayes have it; the Ayes have it. The motion is carried.

The motion was adopted

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up the Calling Attention Notice. Shri Nanda.

18.56 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE—*Contd.*

REPORTED COMPLAINT OF CHIEF MINISTER OF JAMMU AND KASHMIR STATE AGAINST CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Nanda): Sir, Government's attention was drawn to reports in the Press of an

interview given by the Chief Minister, J & K, to a representative of U.N.I. I got in touch with Shri Sadiq. He said that in the course of a general talk with UNI representative he had referred to the reports about Shri Jayaprakash Narayan's interview with Sheikh Abdullah. He had felt unhappy about the manner in which Shri Jayaprakash Narayan's meeting with the Sheikh had been publicised on the radio and in the Press as this might give a wrong impression to some people as if some political talks had been initiated.

2. The facts are that in a letter dated 17-7-1966, to the Prime Minister, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan said that he was visiting Tamil Nad from the 25th July to the 9th August in connection with the Gram Daan Movement, that at the end of his period he would be spending a few days at Kodai Kanal and that during those days he would like to see Sheikh Abdullah. The restrictions on Sheikh Abdullah do not preclude visits to him by his relative and friends with the permission of the concerned authorities. The House knows that Shri Jayaprakash Narayan is an old friend of Sheikh Abdullah. He sought the necessary permission and permission was accordingly given.

3. While the Chief Minister had some apprehension that would have an unsettling effect, he considers that it has had actually no such impact.

On this particular occasion we did not consult the Chief Minister but that was only because we thought that no new issue of policy was involved and Shri Jayaprakash Narayan was meeting Sheikh Abdullah at his own request and in his personal capacity. He was in no sense meeting the Sheikh on behalf of Government. I would also like to clarify that there is identity of general approach between Sadiq's Ministry and the Central Government. It would be taking a wholly unrealistic view of the state of affairs in Kashmir for any suggestion that a meeting between Sheikh Abdullah and Jayaprakash Narayan is going to unsettle things there.

4. The House is aware that there is no uncertainty whatsoever about the future of J&K. We have made it clear repeatedly that Kashmir is not negotiable and that the accession of the State to India is final and irrevocable.

Mr. Speaker: Only Shri Mathur can put one question.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) : औरों का क्या होगा ? हम ने भी तो दे रखा है ? . . (*व्यवधान*)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप का तो आज लेट आया ।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : मैंने तो चार दिन पहले दे रखा है जिस समय मिलने के लिए गये और जिस समय प्रधान मंत्री ने स्वीकृति दी, उसी समय दिया था ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह तो आप ने अलग दिया था । आज आपका जो आया, साढ़े दस के बाद आया । लेकिन आप को एक सवाल पूछने की इजाजत मैं दे दूंगा ।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : (देवास) : हम को भी मौका दिया जाय । यह तो बड़ा इम्पार्टेन्ट सवाल है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं, और किसी का नाम नहीं है ।

Shri Raghunath Singh: This is a very important question.

Mr. Speaker: Importance is no consideration.

श्री वी० चं० शर्मा (गुरदासपुर) हम ने भी तो भेजा था ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : और किसी का नाम नहीं है ।

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): Shri Jayaprakash Narayan may be a man of gold, whatever it may be; the fact is, the unfortunate fact is, that the Chief Minister of Kashmir says, whether it is because of press publicity or whatever it is that it has created a sense of insecurity there. He further complains that not only in this particular matter, but for some time now after Shastriji's death, he is not being consulted. It is further strengthened by the fact that even Shri Dhar, who was here the other day, mentioned that they had sent quite a number of proposals to the Government for better integration and those proposals are now in cold storage. This necessarily creates an uncertainly in the minds of those people there and outside also. Will the hon. Minister say what steps he proposes to take to remove this uncertainty for all times and will the Prime Minister, as the head of Government, make a clear and categorical statement which will remove all uncertainties for all times and take future action to see that no uncertainties are permitted there?

19 hrs.

Shri Nanda: What I stated at the end of this statement was in very categorical and absolute terms so far as the status of Jammu and Kashmir is concerned. The occasion was now to repeat that so that no kind of misgiving or doubt might remain in the mind of anybody. Jammu and Kashmir State is like any other State in the country and there is no question at all of anything happening there in respect of its status. The accession is final, complete and irrevocable. That is the substance of whatever has to be said.

I now come to the earlier point. I have had talks with Sadiq Sahib. What disturbed him was this. He felt that possibly this talk.....

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): It has happened in the past also, unfortunately.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Shri Dhar has said that. That also has created doubts in our minds that you are softpedalling the thing for one reason or another.

Shri Nanda: He though that possibly Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan was on some mission, some assignment, something on behalf of the Goevrnment.

Shri D. C. Sharma: He is always on some mission.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): Why do you perimit him to meet him? He goes on issuing all sorts of statements in the country.

Shri Nanda: As far as I know he has not issued any statement at all.

Shri D. C. Sharma: He is a multipurpose leader.

Shri Nanda: I might inform hon. Members that Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan's position changed after the Indo-Pakistan hostilities.

Shri Raghunath Singh: He has changed his party and position so many times.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: One thing that is consistent about him is that he goes on changing his party.

Shri Nanda: He had made it clear after the Indo-Pak. hostilities of August-September 1965 that Pakistan was no longer a party in the matter, that it was a question solely between the people of Jammu and Kashmir and the rest of India. In a statement published in the press on 17th April, 1966, Shri Jaya Prakash Narain said that he believed that Sheikh Abdullah was realistic enough to realise that no solution of the Jammu and Kashmir question could be accepted by India after the last war with Pakistan that involved de-accession of the State or any part of it; he also ruled out any independent State. That statement of the position of Shri Jaya

Prakash Narayan is something which, I think....

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: That he made before he met Sheikh Abdullah. What was the occasion for him to meet him again and re-open everything?

Shri Nanda: He has not made any statement after that.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: Unfortunately, people get this impression that something new is coming up.

Shri Nanda: If he goes and wants to convert Sheikh Abdullah to this standpoint, I do not think that was .... (*Interruption*).

Shri D. C. Sharma: Have you not sent him to Nagaland and other places?

Shri Nanda: Therefore that was the source of the uncertainty and the best way of clearing it up is to reiterate that position in emphatic, absolute terms as to the status of Jammu and Kashmir so that the fact that somebody meets Sheikh Abdullah should not have any kind of an unsettling effect on anybody's mind.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Proposals were sent by the Chief Minister and they are still pending in your files for six months. You have not taken any decision.

Shri Nanda: I have given all that. The most important thing that has been done is that articles 356 and 357 were applied to the State. That was the crucial thing. The effect of this is that a Proclamation imposing President's Rule can now be made in respect of Jammu and Kashmir State if the President is satisfied that the Government of the State of Jammu and Kashmir cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of India. This is something which covers practically every thing else. That has been the most important step taken and in this the Sadiq Government certainly was very helpful and took the initiative.

I have got a long list of other things which have been done in the recent months at the instance of the Jammu and Kashmir Government. There are also certain proposals for the application to the State of entries in the Concurrent List in the Seventh Schedule, which have been referred to the State Government and are pending with the State Government. This means that this process is going on. Then, a Bill to extend certain Central laws to Jammu and Kashmir State relating to certain entries which have already been made applicable is being undertaken by us. They had made proposals regarding certain laws to be made applicable under those entries and the Bill was ready for introduction. This we had prepared and the question was whether it would be possible to have it through in this session. We have got that ready. All that was required by the State Government has been embodied in the draft Bill which we have got ready and if there is time, there will be no difficulty in getting it (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Everyone is putting questions.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Why should the hon. Prime Minister feel shy of saying something, as the head of the Government, in categorical terms in this matter? Now that she is here, I put a question and if she does not say anything, it has its own meaning. I think, she should be able to say very clearly and categorically that Kashmir is not negotiable, that no uncertainty will be permitted to prevail and that they will take necessary steps.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): The Home Minister has just now said it in very categorical terms. Surely, I am not dissociated with what he has said.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : अध्यक्ष महोदय, काश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में भारत सरकार की नीति पिछले 19 सालों से बराबर दुविधापूर्ण रही है । एक ओर गृहमंत्री कई कई बार हाथ हिला कर कहते हैं कि काश्मीर की स्थिति भारत के अन्य राज्यों जैसी है । दूसरी ओर गुलजारी लाल नन्दा यह भी जानते हैं कि जब तक संविधान की धारा 370 लागू है, काश्मीर में भारत के लोग जाकर बस नहीं सकते, वह सुविधा जो अन्य राज्यों में है, वह काश्मीर राज्य में नहीं है । उनके यह कहने का काश्मीर के नागरिकों और विश्व पर क्या प्रभाव पड़ता है यह वह अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं ।

यही दुविधापूर्ण स्थिति शेख अब्दुल्ला के सम्बन्ध में भी भारत सरकार की रही है । शेख अब्दुल्ला पर चलाये गये मकद्दमे का निर्णय किये बगैर भारत सरकार ने उसको रिहा कर दिया । उसके बाद सरकार ने देखा कि विदेशों में जाकर उन्होंने क्या जहर उगला । उसके बाद उसको फिर गिरफ्तार करना पड़ा । गृह मंत्री जी ने राज्य सभा में कहा कि शेख अब्दुल्ला की नीतियों में कोई परिवर्तन हो गया हो, तब उनको छोड़ने पर विचार किया जा सकता है । श्री जय प्रकाश नारायण का कोडाई-कनाल जाना और समाचार पत्रों में बराबर कई दिनों तक यह आते रहना, रेडियो से भी आया, कि प्रधान मंत्री से उन्होंने अनुमति मांगी है कि वह कोडाई-कनाल जाकर शेख अब्दुल्ला से मिलना चाहते हैं, तथा यह भी कि प्रधान मंत्री ने उनको अनुमति दे दी है, क्या यह सारी की सारी चीज एक योजनाबद्ध नहीं है कि श्री जय प्रकाशनारायण यह कहें कि अब शेख अब्दुल्ला की नीति में परिवर्तन हो गया है और उनको अब वहां से छोड़ दिया जाय और इस प्रकार काश्मीर की स्थिति को फिर से विषम बना दिया जाय । क्यों नहीं प्रधान मंत्री जी स्पष्ट भाषा में, जैसा माथुर साहब ने कहा है कहतीं कि काश्मीर की स्थिति में कोई परिवर्तन नहीं है, संविधान की धारा 370 को हटाया जायगा और काश्मीर के किसी द्रोही को सरकार संरक्षण देने की स्थिति में नहीं आयेगी ।

Shri Nanda: I want to correct one impression created by the interview regarding Sadiq Sahib having said that after the death of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri certain change has occurred. I enquired, and he said that this is a very inaccurate statement and that he had not said anything regarding this.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I have nothing to add except that our position on Kashmir remains the same. We are going ahead with all the programmes it maybe, they could go faster, but there are certain difficulties. In any case, we are in full consultation and full contact with the Government of Kashmir and I think the fears of the hon. Members are entirely unfounded.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : श्री जय प्रकाश नारायण जी के जाने से पहले उनसे आप की कुछ बातचीत हुई थी ।

श्रीमति इंदिरा गांधी : जयप्रकाश जी से मेरी कोई बातचीत नहीं हुई । शेख साहब का लोगों से मिलने की इजाजत है । उनके अलावा और लोग भी मिलने गये हैं ।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : समाचारपत्रों में छपा है कि वह आप से मिल कर गये हैं । उसके बाद की बात नहीं है ।

श्रीमति इंदिरा गांधी : उन्होंने मुझ को पत्र लिखा था और पत्र द्वारा पूछा था कि वह मिलने जा सकते हैं या नहीं । हमने सोचा कि उनके मिलने जाने में कोई हानि नहीं है क्योंकि जितनी जल्दी चीजें नार्मलाइज हों उतना अच्छा है । लेकिन न वह हमारी तरफ से मिलने गये थे और न उनके मिलने से हमारी नीति में कोई फर्क आने वाला है ।

Mr. Speaker: The House stands adjourned to meet again tomorrow at 11 A.M.

19:12 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, August 23, 1966|Bhadra 1, 1888 (Saka)